No. A-767

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES
October 1997 Term



IN RE ANGEL FRANCISCO BREARD,

Petitioner.

On Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus

APPLICATION FOR A STAY OF EXECUTION

Imminent Execution Scheduled
April 14, 1998

Alexander H. Slaughter (VSB#05916)
Counsel of Record
William G. Broaddus (VSB#05284)
Dorothy C. Young (VSB#31155)
McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe LLP
One James Center, 901 E. Cary Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 775-1085

Michele J. Brace (VSB No. 36748)
VIRGINIA CAPITAL REPRESENTATION
RESOURCE CENTER
1001 East Main Street, Suite 510
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 643-8439

Counsel to Angel Francisco Breard

84 pp

APPLICATION FOR STAY OF EXECUTION

Petitioner, Angel Francisco Breard, by counsel, moves this Court to issue an order staying Breard's execution, which is scheduled for April 14, 1998.

Breard, a citizen of Paraguay born in Argentina, filed his first federal habeas corpus petition on August 30, 1996, based in part upon Virginia's violation of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (the "Vienna Convention" or the "treaty") in connection with his case. Two weeks after Breard's petition was filed, the Republic of Paraguay, its Ambassador to the United States and its Consul-General filed a federal complaint (denoted hereafter as the Paraguay suit) based upon the same facts as Breard's Vienna Convention claim, seeking declaratory and injunctive relief against several officials of the Commonwealth of Virginia to vindicate rights conferred upon Paraguay and the Consul-General by the Vienna Convention. After the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court's dismissal of both cases,[1] the Circuit Court for Arlington County set April 14, 1998, as the date for Breard's execution. A copy of this order is attached as Exhibit A.

The plaintiffs in the Paraguay suit filed a Petition for Certiorari in the Court on February 24, 1998. Republic of Paraguay v. Gilmore, No. 97-1390. On March 11, 1998, Breard filed a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in the Court. Breard v. Greene, No. 97-8214. On March 22, 1998, the Paraguay plaintiffs filed an Application for Stay of or Injunction Against Execution pending Disposition of Petition for Certiorari. On March 30, 1998, Breard filed an Application for Stay of Execution based upon his Petition for Certiorari. Both Petitions for Certiorari and Applications for Stay are still pending in the Court.

---

[1]Breard v. Pruett, 134 F.3d 615 (4th Cir. 1998); Paraguay v. Allen, 134 F.3d 622 (4th Cir. 1998).

On April 3, 1998, pursuant to the Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, Apr. 24, 1963, 21 U.S.T. 77, 590 U.N.T.S., 261, the Republic of Paraguay filed in the International Court of Justice (the "ICJ") an Application and a Request for Interim Measures of Protection in a case concerning Angel Francisco Breard: Case Concerning the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (Paraguay v. United States of America). Ex. B. The interim measures of protection sought included: (1) that the Government of the United States take the measures necessary to ensure that Breard not be executed pending the disposition of the case in the ICJ, and (2) that the Government of the United States ensure that no action is taken that might prejudice the rights of the Republic of Paraguay with respect to any decision the ICJ may render on the merits of the case. After hearing oral argument on April 7, 1998, the ICJ entered a unanimous Order on April 9, 1998, attached as Ex. C, indicating that:

> The United States should take all measures at its disposal to ensure that Angel Francisco Breard is not executed pending the final decision in these proceedings, and should inform the Court of all the measures which it has taken in implementation of this Order.

In a concurring declaration, attached as Ex. D, the ICJ's President Stephen M. Schwebel, of the United States, stated:

> It is of obvious importance to the maintenance and development of a rule of law among states that the obligations imposed by treaties be complied with and that, where they are not, reparation be required. The mutuality of interest of States in the effective observance of the obligations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations is the greater in the intermixed global community of today and tomorrow (and the citizens of no State have a higher interest in the observance of those obligations than the peripatetic citizens of the United States). In my view, these

> considerations outweigh the serious difficulties which this Order imposes on the authorities of the United States and Virginia.

Breard asks the Court to stay his scheduled execution to afford the ICJ the opportunity to consider Paraguay's application in a thoughtful manner and without the pressure of an imminent execution date, or the risk that any decision it may reach will have been rendered nugatory by the actions of Virginia state officials. According to a spokesman for the Governor of Virginia, the Governor is not expected to heed the indication of the ICJ in the absence of a similar order from an American court. In an article in the April 7, 1998 edition of the Virginian-Pilot, attached as Ex. E, Laura LaFay reports as follows:

> Gov. Jim Gilmore is unlikely to heed the order of any foreign court, his spokesman, Mark Miner, said Monday. "This was a heinous murder that occurred in Virginia, and the Governor will abide by the rulings of the courts in the United States," said Miner.

The ICJ is one of the principal organs of the United Nations. *See* U.N. Charter, art. 92. The International Court is equal, within the United Nations structure, to the Security Counsel and the General Assembly. *Id.* All member states of the United Nations are subject to the provisions of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. *See* Statute of the International Court of Justice, 59 Stat. 1055 (entered into force Oct. 24, 1945). Article 41 of the Statute of the ICJ authorizes the Court to "indicate, if it considers that circumstances so require, any provisional measures which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party." *See Id.*

There is a dispute among commentators as to whether, given the wording of Article 41, provisional measures decided upon by the ICJ are binding upon the parties. *Compare* Jerome B. Elkind, Interim Protection, A Functional Approach 155, 156 (1981) *with* Hambro, The Binding Character of the Provisional Measures of Protection Indicated by the ICJ, "Rechtsfragen Der

Internationales Organization. Festschrift Für Hans Wehberg, 152-171 (1956). The ICJ has not ruled as to whether an indication of provisional measures is binding on the parties. Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law of the United States § 902 cmt. (1987).

However, the preferred view among commentators is that the member states of the United Nations have "undertake[n] to comply with the decision[s] of the International Court of Justice," including provisional measures, pursuant to Article 94(1) of the United Nations Charter. *See e.g.*, Shabtai Rosenne, The International Court of Justice: An Essay in Political and Legal Theory 82 (1957); Shabtai Rosenne, The Law and Practice of the International Court, 125 (1965); Jerzy Sztucki, Interim Measures in the Hague Court: An Attempt at a Scrutiny, 285 (1982). Accordingly, the ICJ's April 9, 1998 decision is binding upon the United States and should be enforced by this court. *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) (It is "emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.").

Once it became aware of Breard's plight, Paraguay moved quickly to assert its rights in the courts of the United States, and then in the ICJ. Paraguay wished to permit the courts of the United States to have the first opportunity to determine the merits of its case. Paraguay's Cert. Pet. at 28. Breard's execution date was required by Virginia statute to be set within a period of sixty days after a hearing that was required to be held within ten days after the Virginia Attorney General or Commonwealth's Attorney reported to the sentencing court that the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals had affirmed the dismissal of Breard's habeas corpus petition. Va. Code Ann. § 53.1-232.1. The Court of Appeals' decisions affirming dismissal of Breard's habeas petition and Paraguay's lawsuit were issued simultaneously, on January 22, 1998, and Breard's Petition for Rehearing in the Fourth Circuit was denied on February 18, 1998. After engaging in unsuccessful

negotiations with the United States in an effort to resolve the matter Paraguay filed its Application in the ICJ. *See* introductory remarks by Ambassador Cáceres during the public sitting held on April 7, 1998 before the ICJ. Ex. F at 6.

While this is not a stay application based upon a petition for certiorari, nor is it a regular petition for a preliminary injunction, a review of the standards for both may be instructive.

A stay of execution with respect to a pending petition for certiorari should be granted if it is reasonably probable that four members of this Court would consider any of the underlying issues sufficiently meritorious for a grant of *certiorari*, there is a significant possibility that the decision of the Court of Appeals will be reversed, and irreparable harm is likely to result if the decision is not stayed. Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880, 895 (1983). As this Court has previously stated, the traditional standard for granting a preliminary injunction requires a party to show that in the absence of its issuance he will suffer irreparable injury, that the balance of hardships is in his favor, and that he is likely to prevail on the merits. Doran v. Salem Inn, Inc., 422 U.S. 922, 931 (1975).

If the ICJ, upon consideration of the merits, determines that Paraguay's Vienna Convention rights were violated and that this violation should be remedied by a new, it is likely that the Court will grant Breard's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus. While the Commonwealth asserts its interest in the finality of its criminal judgments, the balance of hardships is clearly in Breard's favor, and irreparable harm will indisputably result if the execution is not stayed or preliminarily enjoined: Breard will die on April 14, 1998, unless his execution is stayed or enjoined, while Virginia escapes responsibility for its flagrant violations of federal and international law.

Moreover, the Court should grant a stay of execution or a preliminary injunction in this matter in order to show ICJ the respect it is due as the judicial arm of the United Nations, by preventing the Commonwealth of Virginia from taking an action that would render nugatory any decision by the ICJ as to the enforceability of an international treaty that, by virtue of the Supremacy Clause,[2] is the supreme law of the United States. It is this Court's duty "'to enforce the . . . treaties of the United States, whatever they might be, and . . . [the Vienna Convention] remains the supreme law of the land.'" Air France v. Saks, 470 U.S. 392, 406 (1985) (re: Warsaw Convention), quoting Reed v. Wiser, 555 F.2d 1079, 1093 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 922 (1977).

As Judge Butzner of the Court of Appeals noted in his concurring opinion in the Fourth Circuit's decision on Breard's first federal habeas petition,[3] the Convention affects Americans who travel abroad each year and who might be taken into custody by officials of another country. If America's domestic courts fail to provide any legal remedy when the ICJ has determined that a remedy should be provided to an alien who was convicted in this country and given what some nations deem a "barbaric" sentence of death without the knowledge or intervention of his consulate, the United States is in no position to protest if another country's procedural rules are used to the same effect against Americans detained abroad.

The ICJ ought to be afforded an opportunity to consider carefully the issues raised in Paraguay's case without the looming deadline of Breard's execution, and this Court should then

---

[2]U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2.

[3]Breard v. Pruett, 134 F.3d at 622.

have the opportunity to consider carefully how the United States should respond to the decision rendered by the ICJ.

CONCLUSION

For all these reasons, the Court should stay Breard's execution pending disposition of his Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

ANGEL FRANCISCO BREARD

By Counsel



Alexander H. Slaughter (VSB#05916)
William G. Broaddus (VSB#05284)
Dorothy C. Young (VSB#31155)
MCGUIRE, WOODS, BATTLE & BOOTHE LLP
One James Center, 901 East Cary Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219-4030
(804) 775-1000

Michele J. Brace (VSB# 36748)
VIRGINIA CAPITAL REPRESENTATION RESOURCE CENTER
1001 East Main Street, Suite 510
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 643-8439

CERTIFICATE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was hand delivered to Donald R. Curry, Esquire, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, 900 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219, on April 10, 1998.

William G. Barnes

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF ARLINGTON COUNTY

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

v. Docket Nos. CR92-1467, 1664-1668

ANGEL BREARD,

Defendant.

ORDER

Pursuant to Section 53.1-232.1 of the Code of Virginia, having determined that the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has denied habeas corpus relief to the defendant, this Court hereby ORDERS that the death sentence of Angel Breard be carried out on the 14th day of April, 1998, at such a time of day as the Director of the Department of Corrections shall fix.

It is further ORDERED that at least ten (10) days before April 14, 1998, the Director shall cause a copy of this Order to be delivered to the defendant and, if the defendant is unable to read it, cause it to be explained to him. The Director shall make return thereof to the Clerk of this Court.

The Clerk is directed to promptly furnish certified copies of this Order to the following persons:

Ronald J. Angelone, Director
Virginia Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 26963
6900 Atmore Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23261

The Honorable Richard Trodden
Commonwealth's Attorney
Arlington County
1425 North Courthouse Road
Arlington, Virginia 22201

William G. Broaddus
McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe
One James Center
901 East Cary Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219-4030

Donald R. Curry
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
900 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Entered this 25th day of February, 1998.

Judge

A COPY
TESTE: DAVID A. BELL, CLERK
BY _____
DEPUTY CLERK

CASE CONCERNING THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON CONSULAR RELATIONS

(PARAGUAY V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

APPLICATION INSTITUTING PROCEEDINGS SUBMITTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

TO: Mr. Eduardo Valencia-Ospina
Registrar
International Court of Justice
Peace Palace
The Hague
The Netherlands

Sir:

On behalf of the Republic of Paraguay and in accordance with article 40, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the Court and article 38 of the Rules of the Court, I respectfully submit this Application instituting proceedings in the name of the Government of the Republic of Paraguay against the Government of the United States of America for violations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (done on 24 April 1963) (the "Vienna Convention"). The Court has jurisdiction pursuant to article I of the Vienna Convention's Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes.

Preliminary Statement

1. Article 36, subparagraph 1(b) of the Vienna Convention requires the competent authorities of a State Party to advise, "without delay," a national of another State Party whom such authorities arrest or detain of the national's right to consular assistance guaranteed by article 36. "[I]f he so requests, the competent authorities of the receiving State shall, without delay, inform the consular post of the sending State

if, within its consular district, a national of that state is arrested or committed to prison or to custody pending trial or is detained in any other manner." *Id.*

2. As the Government of the United States stated in its Memorial in the *Case Concerning United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran*:

> a principal function of the consular officer is to provide varying kinds of assistance to nationals of the sending State, and for this reason the channel of communication between officers and nationals must at all times remain open. Indeed, such communication is so essential to the exercise of consular functions that its preclusion would render meaningless the entire establishment of consular relations. Article 36 establishes rights not only for the consular officer but, perhaps even more importantly, for the nationals of the sending State who are assured access to consular officers and through them to others.

1980 I.C.J. Pleadings 174 (citations omitted).

3. In 1992, the authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia, one of the federated states comprising the United States, detained a Paraguayan citizen named Angel Francisco Breard. Without advising Mr. Breard of his right to consular assistance, or notifying Paraguayan consular officers of his detention, as required by the Vienna Convention, such authorities tried and convicted Mr. Breard and sentenced him to death.

4. These actions violated the obligations owed by the United States to Paraguay under the Vienna Convention. As a result of the breach, Paraguay is entitled to *restitutio in integrum*: the re-establishment of the situation that existed before the United States failed to provide the notifications and permit the consular assistance required by the Convention.

I. THE FACTS

Municipal Court Proceedings Concerning Mr. Breard

5. On 1 September 1992, law enforcement authorities of Virginia arrested Mr. Breard on suspicion of murder. Although aware of Mr. Breard's Paraguayan nationality, the authorities at no time informed Mr. Breard of his rights to consular

assistance under article 36, subparagraph 1(b) of the Vienna Convention. Nor did the authorities ever advise Paraguayan consular officers of Mr. Breard's detention. Unaware of, and not having been apprised of, these rights, Mr. Breard could not and did not exercise them before his trial.

6. Had Mr. Breard been properly informed of his rights under the Vienna Convention, he would have communicated with his Consul, seeking the assistance provided for in article 36. In turn, Paraguay would have rendered that assistance.

7. The failure to provide the notification required by the Vienna Convention thus precluded Paraguay from protecting its interests in the United States as provided for in articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention. Among other things, Paraguay could not contact its national, assist in the defense of its national (as described in paragraphs 8 and 10 below), monitor the conditions of its national's detention, or ensure that international legal norms were respected in the treatment of, and proceedings against, its national.

8. The failure to provide the required notification also precluded Paraguay from protecting its national's interests in the United States as provided for in articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention. The authorities of Virginia effectively prevented Paraguayan consular officers from arranging for appropriate legal representation of Mr. Breard. Instead, the authorities themselves arranged for Mr. Breard to be represented by court-appointed counsel who were unfamiliar with Paraguayan culture and with the preconceptions concerning the criminal justice system that a Paraguayan national might be expected to have.

9. As a result of the lack of consular assistance, Mr. Breard made a number of objectively unreasonable decisions during the criminal proceedings against him, which were conducted without translation. He refused to accept the authorities' offer of life in prison in exchange for his pleading guilty to the crime. Instead, Mr. Breard insisted on risking a death sentence and confessing and denouncing his past criminal conduct at trial. Mr. Breard took these highly detrimental steps because – in the absence of advice from his consulate – he did not comprehend the fundamental differences between the criminal justice systems of the United States and Paraguay. Whereas Mr. Breard believed his confession and denunciation would appeal to the mercy of the American court, as he understood they would a court in Paraguay, in reality these acts virtually assured Mr. Breard's conviction and death sentence.

10. Consular assistance would have included advice on cultural and legal differences between Paraguay and the United States, including the desirability of

accepting or rejecting plea offers in light of those differences; an interpreter; appropriate additional or other legal counsel; identifying and communicating with family members who could provide assistance and information; supplying records, documents, and other evidence helpful to Mr. Breard's defense; transport of family members and other witnesses to Virginia to provide testimony; attendance by consular officers at court or other proceedings; collecting and presenting mitigating evidence at the sentencing phase; and other forms of assistance both legal and non-legal. Such consular assistance would have affected the result of the criminal proceeding against Mr. Breard, including any sentence imposed.

11. On 24 June 1993, Mr. Breard was convicted of murder. On 22 August 1993, the trial court imposed a death sentence. Mr. Breard's direct appeals of the conviction and sentence were denied, as was his petition to the state courts for a writ of *habeas corpus*, a collateral proceeding seeking relief from unlawful detention.

12. In the Spring of 1996, Paraguay, without benefit of information from the authorities of Virginia and the United States, finally learned that Mr. Breard was imprisoned in the United States and awaiting execution. Immediately upon learning of his situation, Paraguay, through its embassy and consulate, began rendering assistance, both legal and otherwise, to Mr. Breard. Until contacted by the Paraguayan consular representatives at that time, Mr. Breard had been entirely unaware of his rights under the Vienna Convention.

13. On 30 August 1996, with the assistance of Paraguayan consular officers, Mr. Breard took the final step available to him for challenging his conviction and sentence by filing a petition to the federal court of first instance for a writ of *habeas corpus*. For the first time, Mr. Breard claimed violations of the Vienna Convention. That court rejected the assertion of this and other claims based on a municipal law doctrine of "procedural default." *Breard v. Netherland*, 949 F. Supp. 1255 (E.D. Va. 1996). Applying this doctrine, the court decided that, because Mr. Breard had not asserted his rights under the Vienna Convention in his previous legal proceedings, he could not assert them in the federal *habeas* proceeding. This municipal law doctrine was held to bar such relief even though, first, Mr. Breard was unaware of his rights under the Convention at the time of the earlier legal proceedings, and second, he was unaware of his rights precisely because the local authorities failed to comply with their obligations under the Convention promptly to inform him of those rights. The intermediate federal appellate court affirmed. *Breard v. Pruett*, 134 F.3d 615 (4th Cir. 1998). Mr. Breard's appeal to the intermediate federal appellate court was the last means of legal recourse in the United States available to him as of right.

14. In light of the federal appellate court's affirmance of the federal trial court's denial of Mr. Breard's *habeas* petition, the Virginia court that sentenced Mr. Breard has set an execution date of 14 April 1998. Absent intervention, officials of Virginia will then, in the words of the authorizing statute, "cause the prisoner under sentence of death to be electrocuted or injected with a lethal substance until he is dead." VA. STAT. ANN. § 53.1-234.

15. By petition for a writ of *certiorari*, Mr. Breard has now requested that the United States Supreme Court exercise its discretionary authority to review the lower federal courts' decision against him and grant a stay of his execution pending that review. The Supreme Court grants less than five percent of all *certiorari* petitions submitted to it. Moreover, in cases, such as Mr. Breard's, involving an imminent execution and submitted on an expedited basis, the Court frequently does not rule on the petition and accompanying request for interim relief until days, or even hours, before the scheduled execution.

Paraguay's Efforts To Secure
Relief In The United States

16. On 16 September 1996, the Republic of Paraguay filed its own civil lawsuit in a federal court of first instance against the municipal officials responsible for Mr. Breard's arrest, conviction, continuing imprisonment, and pending execution, alleging violations of the Vienna Convention. Paraguay sought, among other relief, an order vacating Mr. Breard's conviction, barring the municipal officials from taking any future actions based on that conviction, including refraining from putting Mr. Breard to death, and requiring those officials to afford Paraguay its rights under the Convention in any future proceedings should Virginia, as Paraguay would expect, seek to prosecute Mr. Breard anew.

17. Paraguay did not seek from the federal court of first instance, and does not intend to seek from this Court, any relief barring the competent authorities of the United States from enforcing its criminal law or, specifically, retrying Mr. Breard if the competent authorities are so advised. Paraguay does contend, however, that the competent authorities of the United States must enforce the criminal law by means that comport with the obligations undertaken by the United States in the Vienna Convention.

18. On 27 November 1996, without having considered the merits of Paraguay's claim, the federal court of first instance held that it could not take

jurisdiction of the case because it was barred by a municipal doctrine providing sovereign immunity to the several states that comprise the United States. *Paraguay v. Allen*, 949 F. Supp. 1269 (E.D. Va. 1996). Paraguay appealed the decision, which was affirmed. *Paraguay v. Allen*, 134 F.3d 622 (4th Cir. 1998). During the appellate proceedings, the United States took the position that although the Vienna Convention is of great importance to United States nationals abroad, the issue of its own violation of the Convention was not justiciable in the courts of the United States in an action brought by another State Party to the Convention.

19. Paraguay has filed a petition for a writ of *certiorari* in the United States Supreme Court seeking review of the appellate decision. As explained above, a petition for *certiorari* is a matter of the Supreme Court's discretion and is rarely granted.

20. In addition to its efforts to have its claim heard in the courts of the United States, Paraguay has also engaged in diplomatic efforts to gain the assistance of the United States in remedying the effect of the breach of the Vienna Convention. In a letter dated 10 December 1996, the Ambassador of Paraguay sought the good offices of the United States Department of State, "in order that a new trial may be granted Paraguayan citizen Angel Breard within the framework of constitutional guarantees for proper defense against a criminal accusation as well as the strict fulfillment of the stipulations of international treaties covering acts of such nature." In a response delivered 3 June 1997, the Department of State expressed disagreement with Paraguay's legal position and offered no assistance to Paraguay in exercising its rights under the Treaties.

II. THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

21. Under article 36, paragraph 1 of the Statute of the Court, "[t]he jurisdiction of the Court comprises . . . all matters specially provided for . . . in treaties and conventions in force."

22. The Republic of Paraguay and the United States are, as members of the United Nations, parties to the Statute, and are parties to the Vienna Convention and to its Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. Article 1 of the Optional Protocol provides:

> Disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention shall lie within the compulsory jurisdiction of the

International Court of Justice and may accordingly be brought before the Court by an application made by any party to the dispute being a Party to the present Protocol.

23. Paraguay therefore submits that, upon the filing of the present application, the matters in dispute between Paraguay and the United States concerning Paraguay's claims under the Vienna Convention lie within the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

III. THE CLAIMS OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

24. The Government of the Republic of Paraguay claims that:

a. Pursuant to article 36, subparagraph 1(b) of the Vienna Convention, the United States is under the international legal obligation to Paraguay, a State Party to the Convention, to inform "without delay" any Paraguayan national, such as Mr. Breard, who is "arrested or committed to prison or to custody pending trial or is detained in any other manner" of his rights under that subparagraph. These rights include:

i. the right, if the national arrested or detained so requests, to have the competent authorities of the receiving State inform the local consular post of the sending State that that State's national has been so arrested or committed to prison or to custody pending trial or detained in any other manner;

ii. the right to have the competent authorities of the receiving State forward any communication "addressed to the consular post from the person arrested, in prison, custody or detention . . . without delay."

The United States has violated and is currently violating the foregoing obligations.

b. Pursuant to article 36, subparagraph 1(b) of the Vienna Convention, the United States is under the international legal obligation to an arrested national of Paraguay, such as Mr. Breard, to inform him "without delay" of his rights under that subparagraph. These rights include:

i. the right, if the national arrested or detained so requests, to have the competent authorities of the receiving State inform the local consular post of the sending State that that State's national has been so arrested or committed to prison or to custody pending trial or detained in any other manner;

ii. the right to have the competent authorities of the receiving State forward any communication "addressed to the consular post from the person arrested, in prison, custody or detention . . . without delay."

The United States has violated and is currently violating the foregoing obligations with respect to Mr. Breard.

c. Pursuant to article 36 of the Vienna Convention, the United States is under the international legal obligation to ensure that Paraguay can communicate with and assist an arrested national prior to trial. Its failure to provide the notifications required by article 36, subparagraph 1(b) of the Vienna Convention has effectively prevented Paraguay from exercising its right to carry out consular functions pursuant to articles 5 and 36 of the Convention. The United States therefore has violated and is currently violating the foregoing obligation.

d. Pursuant to article 36, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention and article 26 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (done on 23 May 1969), the United States is under an international legal obligation to ensure that its municipal law and regulations enable full effect to be given to the purposes of the rights accorded under article 36. The United States has violated and is currently violating the foregoing obligation.

e. Pursuant to article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and to customary international law, the United States may not derogate from its international legal obligation to uphold the Vienna Convention based upon its municipal law doctrines and rules, nor upon the basis that the acts in derogation are those of a subordinate organ or constituent or judicial power. The United States has violated and is currently violating the foregoing obligation.

IV. THE JUDGMENT REQUESTED

25. Accordingly, the Republic of Paraguay asks the Court to adjudge and declare:

(1) that the United States, in arresting, detaining, trying, convicting, and sentencing Angel Francisco Breard, as described in the preceding statement of facts, violated its international legal obligations to Paraguay, in its own right and in the exercise of its right of diplomatic protection of its national, as provided by articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention;

(2) that Paraguay is therefore entitled to *restitutio in integrum*;

(3) that the United States is under an international legal obligation not to apply the doctrine of "procedural default," or any other doctrine of its internal law, so as to preclude the exercise of the rights accorded under article 36 of the Vienna Convention; and

(4) that the United States is under an international legal obligation to carry out in conformity with the foregoing international legal obligations any future detention of or criminal proceedings against Angel Francisco Breard or any other Paraguayan national in its territory, whether by a constituent, legislative, executive, judicial or other power, whether that power holds a superior or a subordinate position in the organization of the United States, and whether that power's functions are of an international or internal character;

and that, pursuant to the foregoing international legal obligations,

(1) any criminal liability imposed on Angel Francisco Breard in violation of international legal obligations is void, and should be recognized as void by the legal authorities of the United States;

(2) the United States should restore the *status quo ante*, that is, re-establish the situation that existed before the detention of, proceedings against, and conviction and sentencing of Paraguay's national in violation of the United States' international legal obligations took place; and

(3) the United States should provide Paraguay a guarantee of the nonrepetition of the illegal acts.

V. JUDGE *AD HOC*

26. In accordance with the provisions of article 31 of the Statute and article 35, paragraph 1, of the Rules, the Republic of Paraguay declares its intention to exercise its right to name a judge *ad hoc*.

VI. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

27. The Republic of Paraguay reserves the right to modify and extend the terms of this Application, as well as the grounds invoked.

VII. PROVISIONAL MEASURES

28. The Republic of Paraguay requests that the Court indicate interim measures of protection, as set forth in a separate request filed concurrently with this Application.

* *

I have the honor to reassure the Court of my highest esteem and consideration.

Brussels, 3 April 1998

His Excellency Manuel María Cáceres
Ambassador of the Republic of Paraguay to the Kingdom of Belgium and the Kingdom of the Netherlands

CASE CONCERNING THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON CONSULAR RELATIONS

(PARAGUAY V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

REQUEST FOR THE INDICATION OF PROVISIONAL MEASURES OF PROTECTION SUBMITTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

Brussels, 3 April 1998

1. I have the honor to refer to the Application submitted to the Court this day instituting proceedings in the name of the Republic of Paraguay against the Government of the United States of America and to submit, in accordance with article 41 of the Statute of the Court and articles 73, 74, and 75 of the Rules of the Court, an urgent request that the Court indicate provisional measures to preserve the rights of the Republic of Paraguay. The Court has jurisdiction pursuant to article I of the Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.

2. The compelling facts underlying this request are set forth in the Application. On 1 September 1992, law enforcement officials of the Commonwealth of Virginia, one of the United States of America, arrested a national of Paraguay, Angel Francisco Breard. Mr. Breard was subsequently convicted and sentenced to death. At no time did these officials inform Mr. Breard of his right to communicate with his consulate, as required under article 36 of the Vienna Convention. Mr. Breard was and thus remained unaware of his rights under the Convention. As a result, Paraguay was not alerted to Mr. Breard's situation and was unable to exercise its right to render consular assistance until after he had already been tried, convicted, and sentenced.

3. Paraguay was therefore unable to protect its interests as provided for in articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention. Similarly, it was unable to protect its detained national's interests as provided for in those articles.

4. As set forth in the Application, Paraguay submits that the actions of the Virginia officials, attributable to the United States, violated international legal obligations that the United States owes to Paraguay in its own right and in the exercise of its right of diplomatic protection of its national. As further set forth in the Application, Paraguay has requested that the Court declare that the United States has violated its obligations under the Vienna Convention; that the United States is obligated to restore the *status quo ante*; and that the United States is obligated to ensure that any future detention of or criminal proceedings against Mr. Breard or any other Paraguayan national in its territory be carried out in conformity with the international legal obligations the United States owes Paraguay.

5. By order dated 25 February 1998, the Circuit Court of Arlington County, Virginia, United States of America, has ordered that on **14 April 1998**, pursuant to Virginia Code § 53.1-234, Mr. Breard be electrocuted or injected with a lethal substance until he is dead.

6. The importance and sanctity of an individual human life are well established in international law. As recognized by article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, every human being has the inherent right to life and this right shall be protected by law.

7. Under the grave and exceptional circumstances of this case, and given the paramount interest of Paraguay in the life and liberty of its nationals, provisional measures are urgently needed to protect the life of Paraguay's national and the ability of this Court to order the relief to which Paraguay is entitled: restitution in kind. Without the provisional measures requested, the United States will execute Mr. Breard before this Court can consider the merits of Paraguay's claims, and Paraguay will be forever deprived of the opportunity to have the *status quo ante* restored in the event of a judgment in its favor.

8. On behalf of the Government of Paraguay, I therefore respectfully request that, pending final judgment in this case, the Court indicate:

a. That the Government of the United States take the measures necessary to ensure that Mr. Breard not be executed pending the disposition of this case;

b. That the Government of the United States report to the Court the actions it has taken in pursuance of subparagraph (a) immediately above and the results of those actions; and

c. That the Government of the United States ensure that no action is taken that might prejudice the rights of the Republic of Paraguay with respect to any decision this Court may render on the merits of the case.

9. In view of the extreme gravity and immediacy of the threat that authorities in the United States will execute a Paraguayan citizen in violation of obligations the United States owes to Paraguay, Paraguay respectfully asks the Court to treat this request as a matter of the greatest urgency.

10. The Government of the Republic of Paraguay has authorized the undersigned to appear before the Court in any proceedings or hearings relating to this request that the Court may convene in accordance with the terms of article 74, paragraph 3, of the Rules of the Court.

His Excellency Manuel María Cáceres
Ambassador of the Republic of Paraguay to the Kingdom of Belgium and the Kingdom of the Netherlands

General List No. 99

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE
9 April 1998

CASE CONCERNING THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON CONSULAR RELATIONS

(PARAGUAY *v.* UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

REQUEST FOR THE INDICATION OF PROVISIONAL MEASURES

ORDER

Present: *Vice-President* **WEERAMANTRY**, *Acting President*; *President* **SCHWEBEL**; *Judges* **ODA, BEDJAOUI, GUILLAUME, RANJEVA, HERCZEGH, SHI, FLEISCHHAUER, KOROMA, VERESHCHETIN, HIGGINS, PARRA-ARANGUREN, KOOIJMANS, REZEK**; *Registrar* **VALENCIA-OSPINA.**

The International Court of Justice,

Composed as above,

After deliberation,

Having regard to Articles 41 and 48 of the Statute of the Court and to Articles 73, 74 and 75 of the Rules of Court,

Having regard to the Application filed in the Registry of the Court on 3 April 1998, whereby the Republic of Paraguay (hereinafter "Paraguay") instituted proceedings against the United States of America (hereinafter "the United States") for "violations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations [of 24 April 1963]" (hereinafter the "Vienna Convention") allegedly committed by the United States,

Makes the following Order:

1. Whereas, in its aforementioned Application, Paraguay bases the jurisdiction of the Court on Article 36, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the Court and on Article I of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, which accompanies the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations ("the Optional Protocol");

2. Whereas, in the Application, it is stated that in 1992 the authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia arrested a Paraguayan national, Mr. Angel Francisco Breard; whereas it is maintained that he was charged, tried, convicted of culpable homicide and sentenced to death by a Virginia court (the Circuit Court of Arlington County) in 1993, without having been informed, as is required under Article 36, subparagraph 1 *(b)*, of the Vienna Convention, of his rights under that provision; whereas it is specified that among these rights are the right to request that the relevant consular office of the State of which he is national be advised of his arrest and detention, and the right to communicate with that office; and whereas it is also alleged that the authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia also did not advise the Paraguayan consular officers of Mr. Breard's detention, and that those officers were only able to render assistance to him from 1996, when the Paraguayan Government learnt by its own means that Mr. Breard was imprisoned in the United States;

3. Whereas, in the Application, Paraguay states that Mr. Breard's subsequent petitions before federal courts in order to seek a writ of *habeas corpus* failed, the federal court of first instance having, on the basis of the doctrine of "procedural default", denied him the right to invoke the Vienna Convention for the first time before that court, and the intermediate federal appellate court having confirmed that decision; whereas, consequently, the Virginia court that sentenced Mr. Breard to the death penalty set an execution date of 14 April 1998; whereas Mr. Breard, having exhausted all means of legal recourse available to him as of right, petitioned the United States Supreme Court for a writ of *certiorari*, requesting it to exercise its discretionary power to review the decision given by the lower federal courts and to grant a stay of his execution pending that review, and whereas, while this request is still pending before the Supreme Court, it is however rare for that Court to accede to such requests; and whereas Paraguay stated, moreover, that it brought proceedings itself before the federal courts of the United States as early as 1996, with a view to obtaining the annulment of the proceedings initiated against Mr. Breard, but both the federal court of first instance and the federal appellate court held that they had no jurisdiction in the case because it was barred by a doctrine conferring "sovereign immunity" on federated states; whereas Paraguay also filed a petition for a writ of *certiorari* in the Supreme Court, which is also still pending; and whereas Paraguay furthermore engaged in diplomatic efforts with the Government of the United States and sought the good offices of the Department of State;

4. Whereas, in its Application, Paraguay maintains that by violating its obligations under Article 36, subparagraph 1 *(b)*, of the Vienna Convention, the United States prevented Paraguay from exercising the consular functions provided for in Articles 5 and 36 of the Convention and specifically for ensuring the protection of its interests and of those of its nationals in the United States; whereas Paraguay states that it was not able to contact Mr. Breard nor to offer him the necessary assistance, and whereas accordingly Mr. Breard "made a number of objectively unreasonable decisions during the criminal proceedings against him, which were conducted without translation"; and "did not comprehend the fundamental differences between the criminal justice systems of the United States and Paraguay"; and whereas Paraguay concludes from this that it is entitled to *restitutio in integrum*, that is to say "the re-establishment of the situation that existed before the United States failed to provide the notifications . . . required by the Convention";

5. Whereas Paraguay requests the Court to adjudge and declare as follows:

> "(1) that the United States, in arresting, detaining, trying, convicting, and sentencing Angel Francisco Breard, as described in the preceding statement of facts, violated its international legal obligations to Paraguay, in its own right and in the exercise of its right of diplomatic protection of its national, as provided by Articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention;

(2) that Paraguay is therefore entitled to *restitutio in integrum;*

(3) that the United States is under an international legal obligation not to apply to the doctrine of 'procedural default', or any other doctrine of its internal law, so as to preclude the exercise of the rights accorded under Article 36 of the Vienna Convention; and

(4) that the United States is under an international legal obligation to carry out in conformity with the foregoing international legal obligations any future detention of or criminal proceedings against Angel Francisco Breard or any other Paraguayan national in its territory, whether by a constituent, legislative, executive, judicial or other power, whether that power holds a superior or a subordinate position in the organization of the United States, and whether that power's functions are of an international or internal character;

and that, pursuant to the foregoing international legal obligations,

(1) any criminal liability imposed on Angel Francisco Breard in violation of international legal obligations is void, and should be recognized as void by the legal authorities of the United States;

(2) the United States should restore the *status quo ante*, that is, re-establish the situation that existed before the detention of, proceedings against, and conviction and sentencing of Paraguay's national in violation of the United States' international legal obligations took place; and

(3) the United States should provide Paraguay a guarantee of the non-repetition of the illegal acts";

6. Whereas, on 3 April 1998, after having filed its Application, Paraguay also submitted an urgent request for the indication of provisional measures in order to protect its rights, pursuant to Article 41 of the Statute of the Court and to Articles 73, 74 and 75 of the Rules of Court;

7. Whereas, in its request for the indication of provisional measures, Paraguay refers to the basis of jurisdiction of the Court invoked in its Application, and to the facts set out and the submissions made therein; and whereas it reaffirms in particular that the United States has violated its obligations under the Vienna Convention and must restore the *status quo ante;*

8. Whereas, in its request for the indication of provisional measures of protection, Paraguay states that, on 25 February 1998, the Circuit Court of Arlington County, Virginia, ordered that Mr. Breard be executed on 14 April 1998; whereas it emphasizes that "[t]he importance and sanctity of an individual human life are well established in international law" and "[a]s recognized by Article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, every human being has the inherent right to life and this right shall be protected by law"; and whereas Paraguay states in the following terms the grounds for its request and the possible consequences of its dism-sal:

"Under the grave and exceptional circumstances of this case. and given the paramount interest of Paraguay in the life and liberty of its nationals, provisional measures are urgently needed to protect the life of Paraguay's national and the ability of this Court to order the relief to which Paraguay is entitled: restitution in kind. Without the provisional measures requested, the United States will execute Mr. Breard before this Court can consider the merits of Paraguay's claims, and Paraguay will be forever deprived of the opportunity to have the *status quo ante* restored in the event of a judgment in its favour";

9. Whereas Paraguay asks that, pending final judgment in this case, the Court indicate:

"*(a)* That the Government of the United States take the measures necessary to ensure that Mr. Breard not be executed pending the disposition of this case;

(b) That the Government of the United States report to the Court the actions it has taken in pursuance of subparagraph *(a)* immediately above and the results of those actions; and

(c) That the Government of the United States ensure that no action is taken that might prejudice the rights of the Republic of Paraguay with respect to any decision this Court may render on the merits of the case";

and whereas it asks the Court moreover to consider its request as a matter of the greatest urgency "in view of the extreme gravity and immediacy of the threat that the authorities . . . will execute a Paraguayan citizen";

10. Whereas, on 3 April 1998, the Ambassador of Paraguay to the Netherlands addressed a letter to the President of the Court requesting the Court to fix an early date for a hearing on his Government's request for provisional measures, asking the Member of the Court who, in accordance with the provisions of Article 13, paragraph 1, and Article 32, paragraph 1, of the Rules of Court, would exercise the functions of President in the case to "call upon the United States of America to ensure that Mr. Breard is not put to death before the Court's ruling on Paraguay's request for provisional measures"; and indicating that he had been appointed as Agent of Paraguay for the purposes of the case;

11. Whereas, on 3 April 1998, the date on which the Application and the request for provisional measures were filed in the Registry, the Registrar advised the Government of the United States of the filing of those documents, communicated the text of them to that Government by facsimile and sent it a certified copy of the Application, in accordance with Article 40, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court and Article 38, paragraph 4, of the Rules of Court, together with a certified copy of the request for the indication of provisional measures, in accordance with Article 73, paragraph 2, of the Rules of Court; and whereas the Registrar also sent the Government of the United States a copy of the letter addressed that day to the President of the Court by the Agent of Paraguay;

12. Whereas, by identical letters dated 3 April 1998, the Vice-President of the Court addressed both Parties in the following terms:

"Exercising the functions of the presidency in terms of Articles 13 and 32 of the Rules of Court, and acting in conformity with Article 74, paragraph 4, of the said Rules, I hereby draw the attention of both Parties to the need to act in such a way as to enable any Order the Court will make on the request for provisional measures to have its appropriate effects";

and whereas, at a meeting held the same day with the representatives of both Parties, he advised them that the Court would hold public hearings on 7 April 1998 at 10 a.m., in order to afford the Parties the opportunity of presenting their observations on the request for provisional measures;

13. Whereas, by a letter dated 5 April 1998, received in the Registry on 6 April 1998, the Ambassador of the United States to the Netherlands informed the Court of the appointment of an Agent and a Co-Agent of his Government for the case;

14. Whereas, pending the notification under Article 40, paragraph 3, of the Statute of the Court and Article 42 of the Rules of Court, by transmission of the printed text, in two languages, of the Application to the Members of the United Nations and to other States entitled to appear before the Court, the Registrar, on 6 April 1998, informed those States of the filing of the Application and of its subject-matter, and of the request for the indication of provisional measures;

15. Whereas, on 6 April 1998, the Registrar, in accordance with Article 43 of the Rules of Court, addressed the notification provided for in Article 63, paragraph 1, of the Statute to the States, other than the Parties to the dispute, which on the basis of information supplied by the Secretary-General of the United Nations as depositary appeared to be parties to the Vienna Convention and to the Optional Protocol;

16. Whereas, at the public hearings held on 7 April 1998, in accordance with Article 74, paragraph 3, of

the Rules of Court, oral statements on the request for the indication of provisional measures were presented by the Parties:

On behalf of Paraguay: by H. E. Mr. Manuel María Cáceres,
Mr. Donald Francis Donovan,
Mr. Barton Legum,
Dr. José Emilio Gorostiaga;

On behalf of the United States: by Mr. David R. Andrews,
Ms Catherine Brown,
Mr. John R. Crook,
Mr. Michael J. Matheson;

and whereas at the hearings a question was put by a Member of the Court, to which a reply was given orally and in writing;

*

* *

17. Whereas, at the hearings, Paraguay reiterated the line of argument set forth in its Application and its request for the indication of provisional measures;

18. Whereas at the hearing, the United States argued that Mr. Breard's guilt was well established, and pointed out that the accused had admitted his guilt, which Paraguay did not dispute; whereas it recognized that Mr. Breard had not been informed, at the time of his arrest and trial, of his rights under Article 36, subparagraph 1 *(b)*, of the Vienna Convention, and indicated to the Court that this omission was not deliberate; whereas it nonetheless maintained that the person concerned had had all necessary legal assistance, that he understood English well and that the assistance of consular officers would not have changed the outcome of the proceedings brought against him in any way; whereas, referring to State practice in these matters, it stated that the notification provided for by Article 36, subparagraph 1 *(b)*, of the Vienna Convention is unevenly made, and that when a claim is made for failure to notify, the only consequence is that apologies are presented by the government responsible; and whereas it submitted that the automatic invalidation of the proceedings initiated and the return to the *status quo ante* as penalties for the failure to notify not only find no support in State practice, but would be unworkable;

19. Whereas the United States also indicated that the State Department had done everything in its power to help the Government of Paraguay as soon as it was informed of the situation in 1996; and whereas it stated that when, on 30 March 1998, Paraguay advised the Government of the United States of its intention to bring proceedings before the Court if the United States Government did not take steps to initiate consultation and to obtain a stay of execution for Mr. Breard, the Government of the United States had emphasized *inter alia* that a stay of execution depended exclusively on the United States Supreme Court and the Governor of Virginia;

20. Whereas the United States furthermore maintained that Paraguay's contention that the invalidation of the sentence of a person who had not been notified pursuant to Article 36, subparagraph 1 *(b)*, of the Vienna Convention could be required under that instrument, has no foundation in the relevant

provisions, their *travaux préparatoires* or the practice of States, and that, in the event, Mr. Breard has not been prejudiced by the absence of notification; and whereas it pointed out that provisional measures should not be indicated where it appears that the Applicant's argument will not enable it to be successful on the merits;

21. Whereas the United States also stated that, when the Court indicates provisional measures under Article 41 of its Statute, it must take the rights of each of the Parties into consideration and ensure that it maintains a fair balance in protecting those rights; whereas that would not be the case if it acceded to Paraguay's request in these proceedings; and whereas the measures requested by Paraguay would prejudice the merits of the case;

22. Whereas the United States finally alleged that the indication of the provisional measures requested by Paraguay would be contrary to the interests of the States parties to the Vienna Convention and to those of the international community as a whole as well as to those of the Court, and would in particular be such as seriously to disrupt the criminal justice systems of the States parties to the Convention, given the risk of proliferation of cases; and whereas it stated in that connection that States have an overriding interest in avoiding external judicial intervention which would interfere with the execution of a sentence passed at the end of an orderly process meeting the relevant human rights standards;

*

* *

23. Whereas on a request for the indication of provisional measures the Court need not, before deciding whether or not to indicate them, finally satisfy itself that it has jurisdiction on the merits of the case, but whereas it may not indicate them unless the provisions invoked by the Applicant appear, prima facie, to afford a basis on which the jurisdiction of the Court might be founded;

24. Whereas Article I of the Optional Protocol, which Paraguay invokes as the basis of jurisdiction of the Court in this case, is worded as follows:

> "Disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention shall lie within the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and may accordingly be brought before the Court by an application made by any party to the dispute being a Party to the present Protocol";

25. Whereas, according to the information communicated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations as depositary, Paraguay and the United States are parties to the Vienna Convention and to the Optional Protocol, in each case without reservation;

26. Whereas Articles II and III of the aforementioned Protocol provide that within a period of two months after one party has notified the other of the existence of a dispute, the parties may agree to resort not to the International Court of Justice but to an arbitration tribunal or alternatively first to conciliation; but whereas these Articles

> "when read in conjunction with those of Article I and with the Preamble to the Protocols, make it crystal clear that they are not to be understood as laying down a precondition of the applicability of the precise and categorical provision contained in Article I establishing the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in respect of disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Vienna Convention . . ." (*United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran, (United States of America* v. *Iran), Judgment, 24 May 1980, I.C.J. Reports 1980*, pp. 25-26);

27. Whereas, in its Application and at the hearings, Paraguay stated that the issues in dispute between itself and the United States concern Articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention and fall within the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court under Article I of the Optional Protocol; and whereas it concluded from this that the Court has the jurisdiction necessary to indicate the provisional measures requested;

28. Whereas at the hearing, the United States contended, for its part, that Paraguay had not established that the Court had jurisdiction in these proceedings, even prima facie; whereas it argued that there is no dispute between the Parties as to the interpretation of Article 36, subparagraph 1 *(b)*, of the Vienna Convention and nor is there a dispute as to its application, since the United States recognizes that the notification provided for was not carried out; whereas the United States maintained that the objections raised by Paraguay to the proceedings brought against its national do not constitute a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Vienna Convention; and whereas it added that there was no entitlement to *restitutio in integrum* under the terms of that Convention;

29. Whereas the United States moreover indicated to the Court that it had expressed its regret to Paraguay for the failure to notify Mr. Breard of his right to consular access, engaged in consultations with Paraguay on the matter and taken steps to ensure future compliance with its obligations under the Vienna Convention at both the federal and state level;

30. Whereas Paraguay asserts that it is nevertheless entitled to *restitutio in integrum*, that any criminal liability currently imposed on Mr. Breard should accordingly be recognized as void by the legal authorities of the United States and that the *status quo ante* should be restored in that Mr. Breard should have the benefit of the provisions of the Vienna Convention in any renewed proceedings brought against him, no objection to his continued detention meanwhile being made by Paraguay; whereas however the United States believes that these measures are not required by the Vienna Convention, would contravene the understanding underlying the adoption of Article 36 as well as the uniform practice of States, and would put this Court in a position of acting as a universal supreme court of criminal appeals;

31. Whereas there exists a dispute as to whether the relief sought by Paraguay is a remedy available under the Vienna Convention, in particular in relation to Articles 5 and 36 thereof; and whereas this is a dispute arising out of the application of the Convention within the meaning of Article I of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes of 24 April 1963;

32. Whereas the United States claimed nevertheless that prima facie there is no jurisdiction for the Court in this case as Paraguay has no legally cognizable claim to the relief it seeks nor any prospect ultimately of prevailing on the merits, because no prejudice to Mr. Breard has occurred;

33. Whereas the existence of the relief sought by Paraguay under the Convention can only be determined at the stage of the merits; and whereas the issue of whether any such remedy is dependent upon evidence of prejudice to the accused in his trial and sentence can equally only be decided upon at the merits;

34. Whereas the Court finds that, prima facie, it has jurisdiction under Article I of the aforesaid Optional Protocol to decide the dispute between Paraguay and the United States;

* *

35. Whereas the power of the Court to indicate provisional measures under Article 41 of its Statute is intended to preserve the respective rights of the parties pending its decision, and presupposes that irreparable prejudice shall not be caused to rights which are the subject of a dispute in judicial proceedings; whereas it follows that the Court must be concerned to preserve by such measures the rights which may subsequently be adjudged by the Court to belong either to the Applicant, or to the Respondent; and whereas such measures are only justified if there is urgency;

36. Whereas the Court will not order interim measures in the absence of "irreparable prejudice . . . to rights which are the subject of dispute . . ." (*Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France), Interim Protection, Order of 22 June 1973, I.C.J. Reports 1973*, p. 103; *United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran, Provisional Measures, Order of 15 December 1979, I.C.J. Reports 1979*, p. 19, para. 36; *Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina* v. *Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)), Provisional Measures, Order of 8 April 1993, I.C.J. Reports 1993*, p. 19, para. 34);

37. Whereas the execution of Mr. Breard is ordered for 14 April 1998; and whereas such an execution would render it impossible for the Court to order the relief that Paraguay seeks and thus cause irreparable harm to the rights it claims;

38. Whereas the issues before the Court in this case do not concern the entitlement of the federal states within the United States to resort to the death penalty for the most heinous crimes; and whereas, further, the function of this Court is to resolve international legal disputes between States, *inter alia* when they arise out of the interpretation or application of international conventions, and not to act as a court of criminal appeal;

*

* *

39. Whereas, in the light of the aforementioned considerations, the Court finds that the circumstances require it to indicate, as a matter of urgency, provisional measures in accordance with Article 41 of its Statute;

40. Whereas measures indicated by the Court for a stay of execution would necessarily be provisional in nature and would not in any way prejudge findings the Court might make on the merits; and whereas the measures indicated would preserve the respective rights of Paraguay and of the United States; and whereas it is appropriate that the Court, with the co-operation of the Parties, ensure that any decision on the merits be reached with all possible expedition;

41. For these reasons,

THE COURT

Unanimously,

I. *Indicates* the following provisional measures:

The United States should take all measures at its disposal to ensure that Angel Francisco Breard is not executed pending the final decision in these proceedings, and should inform the Court of all the measures which it has taken in implementation of this Order;

II. *Decides*, that, until the Court has given its final decision, it shall remain seised of the matters which form the subject-matter of this Order.

Done in English and in French, the English text being authoritative, at the Peace Palace, The Hague, this ninth day of April, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight, in three copies, one of which will be placed in the archives of the Court and the others transmitted to the Government of the Republic of Paraguay and the Government of the United States of America, respectively.

(Signed) Christopher G. WEERAMANTRY,
Vice-President.

(Signed) Eduardo VALENCIA-OSPINA,
Registrar.

President SCHWEBEL and Judges ODA and KOROMA append declarations to the Order of the Court.

(Initialled) C.G.W.

(Initialled) E. V.O.

International Court of Justice

Press Communiqué 98/17

9 April 1998

Case concerning the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (Paraguay v. United States of America)

Provisional measures

The Court calls on the United States to take measures to prevent the execution of Angel Breard, pending a final decision

THE HAGUE, 9 April 1998. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) today called on the United States to "take all measures at its disposal" to prevent the execution of Mr. Angel Francisco Breard, pending a final decision of the Court in the proceedings instituted by Paraguay. Mr. Breard is a Paraguayan national convicted of murder in Virginia (United States) whose execution is scheduled for 14 April 1998.

In its Order, adopted unanimously, the Court also requested the United States to inform it of all the measures taken in implementation of it.

Paraguay instituted proceedings against the United States on 3 April 1998 in a dispute concerning alleged violations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963. It maintains that Mr. Breard was arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced to death without Virginia advising him of his right to assistance by the consular officers of Paraguay, as required by the Vienna Convention. Accordingly, Paraguay asked the Court to adjudge and declare that it is entitled to restitutio in integrum, that is, the re-establishment of the situation that existed before the United States failed to provide the required notification. In view of the urgency of the case, Paraguay also requested the Court to indicate provisional measures to the effect that the United States should refrain from executing Mr. Breard before the Court could consider Paraguay's claims. Paraguay made clear that it does not seek the release of Mr. Breard.

In the reasoning leading to its decision, the Court finds that the execution of Mr. Breard "would render impossible the ordering by the Court of the relief that Paraguay seeks and thus cause irreparable harm to the rights it claims".

The Court nevertheless points out that the issues before it "do not concern the entitlement of the federal states within the United States to resort to the death penalty for the most heinous crimes" and recalls that its function is "to resolve international legal disputes between States . . . and not to act as a court of criminal appeal".

It states that "it is appropriate that the Court, with the co-operation of the Parties, ensure that any decision on the merits be reached with all possible expedition".

The Court had established at the outset that a dispute exists prima facie between the Parties as to the application of the Vienna Convention and that it has jurisdiction prima facie to examine it. Paraguay and the United States are both parties to the Vienna Convention and to its Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, Article I of which provides that"disputes arising out of the

Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, Article I of which provides that"disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention shall lie within the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice".

Further proceedings

Vice-President Weeramantry will soon convene a meeting with the Parties to consult them on the subsequent procedure. The Vice-President of the Court exercises the functions of the presidency in the case, as the President is a national of the United States.

After the Parties' views have been ascertained, time-limits will be fixed for the filing of written pleadings.

The Court was composed as follows in the case: Vice-President Weeramantry, Acting President; President Schwebel; Judges Oda, Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Herczegh, Shi, Fleischhauer, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Higgins, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans, Rezek; Registrar Valencia-Ospina.

President Schwebel, and Judges Oda and Koroma appended declarations to the Order.

The text of the declarations (in their original language) can be found in an Annex to this press release.

The full text of the Order and of the declarations (in their original language) is already available on the Court's Website (**http://www.icj-cij.org**).

A summary of the Order will be available later.

The printed text of the Order and of the declarations appended to it will become available in due course (orders and enquiries should be addressed to the Distribution and Sales Section, Office of the United Nations, 1211 Geneva 10; to the Sales Section, United Nations, New York, N.Y. 10017; or any appropriate specialized bookshop).

Information Office:

Mr. Arthur Witteveen, Secretary of the Court (tel: 31-70 302 2336)

Mrs. Laurence Blairon, Information Officer (tel: 31-70 302 2337)

Annex to Press Communiqué No. 98/17

Declaration of President Schwebel

I have voted for the Order, but with disquiet. The sensitive issues it poses have been hastily, if ably, argued. The evidence introduced is bare. The Court's consideration of the issues of law and fact, in the circumstances imposed upon it, has been summary. The United States maintains that no State has ever before claimed as Paraguay now does that, because of lack of consular access under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, the results of a trial, conviction, and appeal should be voided. Not only has the United States apologized to Paraguay for the unintentional failure of notification to Paraguay's consul of the arrest and trial of the accused, but it has taken substantial steps to strengthen what appears to be a practice in the United States of variable compliance with the obligations imposed upon it by the Vienna Convention.

All this said, I have voted for the Order indicating provisional measures suggested pursuant to

All this said, I have voted for the Order indicating provisional measures suggested pursuant to Article 41 of the Statute of the Court. Those measures ought to be taken to preserve the rights of Paraguay in a situation of incontestable urgency.

I have so voted essentially for these reasons. There is an admitted failure by the Commonwealth of Virginia to have afforded Paraguay timely consular access, that is to say, there is an admitted breach of treaty. An apology and Federal provision for avoidance of future such lapses does not assist the accused, who Paraguay alleges was or may have been prejudiced by lack of consular access, a question which is for the merits. It is of obvious importance to the maintenance and development of a rule of law among States that the obligations imposed by treaties be complied with and that, where they are not, reparation be required. The mutuality of interest of States in the effective observance of the obligations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations is the greater in the intermixed global community of today and tomorrow (and the citizens of no State have a higher interest in the observance of those obligations than the peripatetic citizens of the United States). In my view, these considerations outweigh the serious difficulties which this Order imposes on the authorities of the United States and Virginia.

Declaration of Judge Oda

1. I voted in favour of the Court's Order with great hesitation as I believed and I still believe that the request for the indication of provisional measures of protection submitted by Paraguay to the Court should have been dismissed. However, in the limited time - one or two days - given to the Court to deal with this matter, I have found it impossible to develop my points sufficiently to persuade my colleagues to alter their position.

2. First of all, I would like to express some of my thoughts in connection with this request.

I can, on humanitarian grounds, understand the plight of Mr. Breard and recognize that owing to the fact that Paraguay filed this request on 3 April 1998, his fate now, albeit unreasonably, lies in the hands of the Court.

I would like to add, however, that, if Mr. Breard's rights as they relate to humanitarian issues are to be respected then, in parallel, the matter of the rights of victims of violent crime (a point which has often been overlooked) should be taken into consideration. It should also be noted that since his arrest, Mr. Breard has been treated fairly in all legal proceedings within the American judicial system governed by the rule of law.

The Court cannot act as a court of criminal appeal and cannot be petitioned for writs of habeas corpus. The Court does not have jurisdiction to decide matters relating to capital punishment and its execution, and should not intervene in such matters.

* *

3. As stated earlier, Paraguay's request was presented to the Court on 3 April 1998 in connection with and at the same time as its Application instituting proceedings against the United States for violations of the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. Paraguay's Application was unilaterally submitted to the Court on the basis of the Optional Protocol. I very much doubt that, on the date of filing of the Application and the request, there was any "dispute[s] arising out of the interpretation or application of the [Vienna] Convention" (Optional Protocol, Article I).

If there was any dispute between Paraguay and the United States concerning the interpretation or application of the Vienna Convention, it could have been that the United States was presumed to have violated the Convention at the time of the arrest of Mr. Breard in 1992, as the United States did not inform the Paraguayan consul of that event.

This issue was raised by Paraguay when it became aware of Mr. Breard's situation. In 1996, negotiations took place between Paraguay and the United States concerning the consular function provided for under the Convention. In July 1997, the United States proceeded to remedy the

provided for under the Convention. In July 1997, the United States proceeded to remedy the violation by sending a letter to the Government of Paraguay apologizing for its failure to inform the consul of the events concerning Mr. Breard and giving an assurance that this failure would not be repeated in future. In my view, the United States was thus released from its responsibility for violation of the Vienna Convention.

From that time, the question of violation of the Vienna Convention, which may have led to a dispute concerning its application and interpretation, no longer existed. However, this question was raised once more on 3 April 1998, the date on which Paraguay's Application was filed.

4. What did Paraguay ask the Court to decide in its Application of 3 April 1998? Paraguay asked mainly for a decision relating to Mr. Breard's personal situation, namely, his pending execution by the competent authorities of the State of Virginia.

Paraguay requested restitutio in integrum. However, if consular contact had occurred at the time of Mr. Breard's arrest or detention, the judicial procedure in the United States domestic courts relating to his case would have been no different. This point was made clear in the pleadings of both Parties.

• •

5. I would like to turn to some general issues relating to provisional measures. First, as a general rule, provisional measures are granted in order to preserve rights exposed to imminent breach which is irreparable and these rights must be those to be considered at the merits stage of the case, and must constitute the subject-matter of the Application or be directly related to it. In this case, however, there is no question of such rights (of States parties), as provided for by the Vienna Convention, being exposed to an imminent irreparable breach.

6. Secondly, in order that provisional measures may be granted by the Court, the Court has to have, at the very least, prima facie jurisdiction to deal with the issues concerning the rights of the States parties. However I believe that, as regards the present request for provisional measures, the Court does not even have prima facie jurisdiction to handle this matter.

7. Thirdly, if the request in the present case had not been granted, the Application itself would have become meaningless. If that had been the case, then I would have had no hesitation in pointing out that the request for provisional measures should not be used to ensure that the main Application continue. In addition the request for provisional measures should not be used by applicants for the purpose of obtaining interim judgments that would affirm their own rights and predetermine the main case.

8. I have thus explained why I formed the view that, given the fundamental nature of provisional measures, those measures should not have been indicated upon Paraguay's request.

I reiterate, however, that I voted in favour of the Order, for humanitarian reasons, and in view of the fact that, if the execution were to be carried out on 14 April 1998, whatever findings the Court might have reached might be without object.

Declaration of Judge Koroma

My decision to vote in favour of the Order granting the interim measures of protection in this matter was reached only after careful consideration and in the light of the urgency and exceptional circumstances of this case. Torn as I was between the need to observe the requirements for granting provisional measures of protection under Article 41 of the Statute of the Court, thereby ensuring that whatever decision the Court might reach should not be devoid of object, and the need for the Court to comply with its jurisdiction to settle disputes between States which, in my view, includes respect for the sovereignty of a State in relation to its criminal justice system.

It was, therefore, both propitious and appropriate, for the Court to bear in mind its mission which is to decide disputes between States, and not to act as a universal supreme court of criminal appeal. On the other hand, it is equally true that the Court's function is to decide disputes between States which are submitted to it in accordance with international law, applying international conventions, etc. The Order, in my judgement, complies with these requirements.

Paraguay's Application, filed on 3 April 1998 instituting proceedings against the United States for purported violations of the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, inter alia, requested the Court to grant provisional measures of protection under Article 41 of the Statute so as to protect its rights and the right of one of its nationals who had been convicted of a capital offence committed in the United States and sentenced to death.

The purpose of a request for provisional measures is to preserve as well as to safeguard the rights of the parties that are in dispute, especially when such rights or subject matter of the dispute could be irretrievably or irreparably destroyed thereby rendering the Court's decision ineffective or without object. It is in the light of such circumstances that the Court has found it necessary to indicate interim measures of protection with the aim of preserving the respective rights of either party to the dispute. But prior to this, the applicant State has the burden of indicating that prima facie, the Court has jurisdiction.

When the facts presented were considered by the Court in the light of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, in particular in relation to its Articles 5 and 36, and Article I of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes of 24 April 1963, the Court reached the correct conclusion that a dispute existed and that its jurisdiction had been established prima facie.

In my view, in granting this Order, the Court met the requirements set out in Article 41 of the Statute, whilst at the same time the Order preserves the respective rights of either party - Paraguay and the United States. The Order called for the suspension of the sentence of execution of Mr. Breard on 14 April 1998, thereby preserving his right to life pending the final decision of the Court on this matter, and also recognized the United States' criminal sovereignty in matters such as charging, trying, convicting and sentencing suspects as appropriate, within the United States or its jurisdiction. I concur with this finding.

In reaching this decision, the Court has also acted with the necessary judicial prudence in considering a request for interim measures of protection, in that it should not deal with issues which are not immediately relevant for the protection of the respective rights of either party or which are for the merits. It also thus, once again confirmed its consistent jurisprudence that a provisional measure of protection should only be granted where it is indispensable and necessary for the preservation of the respective rights of either party and only with circumspection. It was in the light of the foregoing consideration, that I joined the Court in granting the request under Article 41 of the Statute.

Home Page | What's new | Docket | List of cases | General Information | Basic documents | Publicat

nian-Pilot

SERVING HAMPTON ROADS SINCE 1865

Man was guilty, U.S. says, even if Paraguay never knew of his case

BY LAURA LaFAY
STAFF WRITER

Angel Francisco Breard, the Paraguayan citizen scheduled to be executed in Virginia next week, is guilty of rape and murder and would have been sentenced to death whether or not his country's embassy had been notified of his predicament, lawyers for the United States argued in the International Court of Justice Tuesday.

Breard, who was sentenced to death for killing an Arlington woman in 1992, is at the center of an unprecedented international legal fight between the United States and his native country, The Republic of Paraguay.

That fight was articulated Tuesday in a courtroom in The Hague, Netherlands, where lawyers for both sides argued before the

Please see **Trial, Page A7** ◆

Trial: Paraguay asks court to prevent execution

Continued from Page A1

judicial arm of the United Nations, also known as the World Court.

The United States maintains that Virginia has a right to execute Breard for his crime. Paraguay contends it does not.

Virginia officials obtained Breard's death sentence in violation of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, argued lawyers for the South American republic. The Vienna Convention is an international treaty that requires consular notification whenever one country arrests and detains a citizen of another.

Had Paraguayan counsel been notified of Breard's predicament, the lawyers contend, Breard would have been advised to accept an Arlington prosecutor's offer of a life sentence in exchange for a guilty plea.

Breard instead went to trial, took the stand and confessed, claiming a satanic curse placed on him by his father-in-law had caused him to commit the crime.

The United States has conceded that no one told Breard he could contact the Paraguayan consul for legal help, and no one told the consul about Breard's arrest.

Doesn't matter, State Department lawyers argued Tuesday.

Nobody *prevented* Breard from contacting his embassy. He had court-appointed lawyers, spoke English well, and "unquestionably committed the offenses for which he was tried."

Furthermore, "Virginia officials have advised us that no actual offer of a plea agreement was ever made. . . . Thus Paraguay's assumption that Mr. Breard could have avoided the death penalty through a plea bargain does not withstand scrutiny," State Department lawyer Catherine Brown told the court. Her statement contradicted affidavits from Breard's court-appointed lawyers, who said there was an offer.

Paraguay wants the World Court to issue what the court calls a "provisional measure" preventing the United States from executing Breard while it considers what to do about the treaty violation.

"Paraguay does not contend that Mr. Breard is not subject to retrial or to future prosecution," Donald Francis Donovan, a lawyer for Paraguay, told the court.

"The fundamental contention of Paraguay is that in any such retrial, Paraguay's rights and Mr. Breard's rights under the Vienna Convention must be respected."

But what about the rights of the United States and Virginia? asked the three State Department lawyers who argued for the United States.

"Provisional measures should not protect the rights of one party while disregarding the rights of the other," said John Crook, assistant legal adviser for United Nations Affairs.

"Paraguay has made clear its goal here is to prevent the operation of the criminal laws of the commonwealth of Virginia . . . This would significantly impair the rights of the United States to the orderly and conclusive functioning of its criminal justice system."

The American lawyers also argued that the World Court has no jurisdiction over the Breard matter because its function is to settle treaty disputes between participating nations.

There is no dispute between Paraguay and the United States, said the lawyers, because the United States has acknowledged and apologized for ignoring the Vienna Convention in the Breard case.

In addition, they argued, the World Court would set a dangerous precedent if it interfered in a U.S. criminal matter. It would set itself up as a "supreme court of criminal appeals" for those punished and imprisoned in foreign countries.

"Once the court opens itself to this process, it can be expected that a great many defendants will press the (countries) of their nationality to take recourse to it," said Michael Matheson, deputy legal adviser in the case.

Such a situation would present problems for the United States. According to Amnesty International, there are 71 foreign nationals on American death rows, and another 20,000 in state and federal prisons.

The court is expected to announce its decision Thursday. Breard's execution is set for April 14.

Uncorrected

Non-corrigé

CR 98/7

International Court of Justice

THE HAGUE

Cour internationale de Justice

LA HAYE

YEAR 1998

Public sitting

held on Tuesday 7 April 1998, at 10 a.m., at the Peace Palace,

Vice-President Weeramantry, Acting President, presiding

in the case concerning the Application of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (Paraguay v. United States of America)

Request for the Indication of Provisional Measures

VERBATIM RECORD

ANNEE 1998

Audience publique

tenue le mardi 7 avril 1998, à 10 heures, au Palais de la Paix,

sous la présidence de M. Weeramantry, vice-président, faisant fonction de président

en l'affaire de l'Application de la convention de Vienne sur les relations consulaires (Paraguay c. Etats-Unis d'Amérique)

Demande en indication de mesures conservatoires

COMPTE RENDU

Present:	Vice-President	Weeramantry, Acting President	*Présents :*	M.	Weeramantry, vice-président, faisant fonction de président en l'affaire
	President	Schwebel		M.	Schwebel, president
	Judges	Oda		MM.	Oda
		Bedjaoui			Bedjaoui
		Guillaume			Guillaume
		Ranjeva			Ranjeva
		Herczegh			Herczegh
		Shi			Shi
		Fleischhauer			Fleischhauer
		Koroma			Koroma
		Vereshchetin			Vereshchetin
		Higgins		Mme	Higgins
		Parra-Aranguren		MM.	Parra-Aranguren
		Kooijmans			Kooijmans
		Rezek			Rezek,
	Registrar,	Valencia-Ospina		M.	Valencia-Ospina, greffier

The Government of the Republic of Paraguay is represented by:

H. E. Mr. Manuel María Cáceres, Ambassador of the Republic of Paraguay to the Kingdom of Belgium and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Brussels,

as Agent;

Mr. Donald Francis Donovan, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. Barton Legum, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. Don Malone, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. José Emilio Gorostiaga, Professor of Law at the University of Paraguay in Asunción and Legal Counsel to the Office of the President of Paraguay,

as Counsel and Advocates.

Le Gouvernement de la République du Paraguay est représenté par:

S. Exc. M. Manuel María Cáceres, ambassadeur du Paraguay au Royaume de Belgique et au Royaume des Pays-Bas, à Bruxelles,

comme agent;

M. Donald Francis Donovan, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. Barton Legum, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. Don Malone, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. José Emilio Gorostiaga, professeur de droit à l'Université du Paraguay à Asunción et conseiller juridique de la Présidence du Paraguay,

comme conseils et avocats.

The Government of the United States of America is represented by:

Mr. David R. Andrews, Legal Adviser, United States Department of State,

as Agent;

Mr. Michael J. Matheson, Deputy Legal Adviser, United States Department of State,

as Co-Agent;

Mr. John R. Crook, Assistant Legal Adviser for United Nations Affairs, United States Department of State

Ms. Catherine Brown, Assistant Legal Adviser for Consular Affairs, United States Department of State

as Counsel and Advocates;

Mr. Sean D. Murphy, Legal Counsellor, United States Embassy, The Hague,

Mr. Robert J. Ericson, United States Department of Justice,

as Counsel.

Le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique est représenté par:

M. David R. Andrews, conseiller juridique du département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme agent;

M. Michael J. Matheson, conseiller juridique adjoint principal du département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme coagent;

M. John R. Crook, conseiller juridique adjoint chargé des questions concernant les Nations Unies au département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

Mme Catherine Brown, conseiller juridique adjoint chargé des affaires consulaires au département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme conseils et avocats;

M. Sean D. Murphy, conseiller juridique à l'ambassade des Etats-Unis, La Haye,

M. Robert J. Ericson, du département de la justice des Etats-Unis,

comme conseils.

The VICE-PRESIDENT, Acting President: Please be seated. The sitting is open. The Court meets today, pursuant to Article 74, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Court, to hear the observations of the Parties on the request for the indication of provisional measures submitted by the Republic of Paraguay in the case concerning the *Application of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations* (*Paraguay* v. *United States of America*).

Article 32, paragraph 1, of the Rules of Court provides that, if the President of the Court is a national of one of the parties to a case, he shall not exercise the functions of the presidency in respect of that case. The President of the Court, Judge Schwebel, will therefore not be exercising the functions of the presidency in this case and it falls to me, in my capacity as Vice-President of the Court, to do so, in accordance with Article 13 of the Rules of Court.

The proceedings were instituted on 3 April 1998 by the filing in the Registry of the Court of an application by the Government of the Republic of Paraguay against the United States of America. In that Application, the Government of Paraguay refers, as a basis for the Court's jurisdiction, to Article I of the Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963.

Paraguay claims that the United States has acted in violation of obligations owed to Paraguay under Article 36, subparagraph 1 *(b)*, of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. It contends that,

> "In 1992, the authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia, one of the federated states comprising the United States, detained a Paraguayan citizen named Angel Francisco Breard. Without advising Mr. Breard of his right to consular assistance, or notifying Paraguayan consular officers of his detention, as required by the Vienna Convention, such authorities tried and convicted Mr. Breard and sentenced him to death"

and asks the Court for *restitutio in integrum,* or

> "the re-establishment of the situation that existed before the United States failed to provide the notifications and permit the consular assistance required by the Convention".

I will now ask the Registrar to read out the decision requested of the Court, as formulated in paragraph 25 of the Application of Paraguay:

The REGISTRAR:

> "The Republic of Paraguay asks the Court to adjudge and declare:
>
> (1) that the United States, in arresting, trying, convicting and sentencing Angel Francisco Breard, as described in the preceding statement of facts, violated its international legal obligations to Paraguay, in its own right and in the exercise of its right of diplomatic protection of its national, as provided by Articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention;
>
> (2) that Paraguay is therefore entitled to *restitutio in integrum*;
>
> (3) that the United States is under an international legal obligation not to apply the doctrine of 'procedural default', or any other doctrine of its internal law, so as to preclude the exercise of the rights accorded under Article 36 of the Vienna Convention; and
>
> (4) that the United States is under an international legal obligation to carry out in conformity with the foregoing international legal obligations any future detention of or criminal proceedings against Angel Francisco Breard or any other Paraguayan national in its territory, whether by a constituent, legislative, executive, judicial or other power, whether that power holds a superior or a subordinate position in the organization of the United States, and whether that power's functions are of an international or internal character;
>
> and that, pursuant to the foregoing international legal obligations,
>
> (1) any criminal liability imposed on Angel Francisco Breard in violation of international legal obligations is void, and should be recognized as void by the legal authorities of the United States;
>
> (2) the United States should restore the *status quo ante*, that is re-establish the situation that existed before the detention of, proceedings against, and conviction and sentencing of Paraguay's national in violation of the United States' international legal obligations took place; and
>
> (3) the United States should provide Paraguay a guarantee of the non-repetition of the illegal acts."

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you. Immediately after the filing of the Application, on 3 April 1998, the Agent of Paraguay filed in the Registry of the Court a request for the indication of provisional measures pursuant to Article 73 of the Rules of Court. Paraguay stated, in that request, that

> "By order dated 25 February 1998, the Circuit Court of Arlington County, Virginia, United States of America, has ordered that on 14 April 1998, pursuant to Virginia Code ð 53.1-234, Mr. Breard be electrocuted or injected with a lethal substance until he is dead."

Paraguay further indicated that

> "Under the grave and exceptional circumstances of this case, and given the paramount interest of Paraguay in the life and liberty of its nationals, provisional measures are urgently needed to protect the life of Paraguay's national and the ability of this Court to order the relief to which Paraguay is entitled: restitution in kind. Without the provisional measures requested, the United States will execute Mr. Breard before this Court can consider the merits of Paraguay's claims, and Paraguay will be forever deprived of the opportunity to have the *status quo ante* restored in the event of a judgment in its favour."

It asked the Court to treat the matter as one of "the greatest urgency" in view of "the extreme gravity and immediacy of the threat".

I will now ask the Registrar to read out the provisional measures which the Agent of Paraguay, in paragraph 8 of the request, asks the Court to indicate.

The REGISTRAR:

> "On behalf of the Government of Paraguay I therefore respectfully request that, pending final judgment in this case, the Court indicate:
>
> *(a)* That the Government of the United States take the measures necessary to ensure that Mr. Breard not be executed pending the disposition of this case;
>
> *(b)* That the Government of the United States report to the Court the actions it has taken in pursuance of subparagraph *(a)* immediately above and the results of those actions; and
>
> *(c)* That the Government of the United States ensure that no action is taken that might prejudice the rights of the Republic of Paraguay with respect to any decision this Court may render on the merits of the case."

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Immediately upon the filing of the Request, the certified copy of the Request for the indication of provisional measures to which reference is made in Article 73, paragraph 2 of the Rules of Court, was transmitted to the Government of the United States.

Immediately upon the filing of the Request, letters were sent by the Vice-President of the Court to each of the Parties, pursuant to Article 74, paragraph 4, of the Rules of Court, drawing their attention to the need to act in such a way as to enable any Order the Court might make on the request for provisional measures to have its appropriate effects.

According to Article 74 of the Rules of Court, a request for the indication of provisional measures "shall have priority over all other cases" and if the Court is not sitting when the request is made, it is to be convened forthwith for the purpose of proceeding to a decision on that request. Moreover, the date of the oral proceedings must be fixed in such a way as to afford the Parties the opportunity of being

oral proceedings must be fixed in such a way as to afford the Parties the opportunity of being represented at it. Consequently, following a meeting held between the Vice-President and the representatives of both Parties on the date the request was filed, the Parties were informed that the date for the oral proceedings contemplated by Article 74, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Court, during which they could present their observations on the request for the indication of provisional measures, had been fixed as 7 April 1998 at 10 a.m.

I note the presence in Court of Agents and Counsel of the two Parties. The Court will first hear the Republic of Paraguay, the Applicant on the merits and the State which has requested the indication of provisional measures. I accordingly give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Manuel Cáceres, Agent of Paraguay.

Mr. CACERES:

1. Introduction

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President and distinguished Members of the Court. My name is Manuel María Cáceres. I am the Agent for the Government of the Republic of Paraguay in this case.

2. Attempts to Resolve Dispute

Paraguay recognizes the busy schedule of this Court. Paraguay therefore deeply appreciates the Court's willingness to convene on this request for provisional measures on such short notice.

Paraguay further recognizes that, given its national, Angel Francisco Breard, is scheduled to be executed exactly one week from today, the Court must act with great alacrity if its decision on Paraguay's request for provisional measures is to have any effect. Again, Paraguay deeply appreciates the deliberative efforts that the Court and its Members will now be required to devote to our request.

I therefore wish to assure the Court that Paraguay has filed this Application and asserted this request for provisional measures only after exhaustive efforts to resolve this dispute without intervention of this Court. As detailed in Paraguay's Application, Paraguay has attempted to resolve the dispute not only through diplomatic negotiations, but also by taking the unusual step of pursuing relief through the municipal court system of the United States of America. None of these avenues has proved fruitful.

Just last week, Paraguay and the United States resumed efforts in the form of a series of high-level meetings in Asunción, which both parties hoped would make it possible to avoid recourse to this Court.

To our regret, however, no resolution has been achieved. Thus, as the Court knows, we initiated proceedings last Friday and have asked the Court to indicate provisional measures that will ensure that Paraguay's national is not executed during the pendency of these proceedings.

3. Introduction of Counsel

To make Paraguay's oral submission in support of its Application for provisional measures, I now introduce Professor José Emilio Gorostiaga, Professor of Law at the University of Paraguay and Legal Counsel to the Office of the President of Paraguay. I also introduce Mr. Donald Francis Donovan of Debevoise & Plimpton in New York, and Mr. Barton Legum also of Debevoise & Plimpton in New York and Mr. Don Malone as well of the same law firm.

Mr. Donovan will commence our oral submissions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr. Donovan, please.

Mr. DONOVAN:

II. SUMMARY, TREATIES, AND JURISDICTION

1. Introduction and Summary

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President, and distinguished Members of the Court.

We are acutely aware of the time pressure under which the Court takes up this matter in light of the scheduled execution of Angel Francisco Breard, Paraguay's national, on 14 April, this coming Tuesday. In our scheduling meeting on Friday, the Court made it clear that it wished us to keep our oral submissions as brief as possible, and if at all possible to no more than one hour. We will certainly respect that request.

This case facilitates a succinct submission as it arrives at this Court, the case presents a straightforward dispute both as a matter of the underlying facts and of the governing principles of law. We believe as well that the circumstances relevant to our request for provisional measures — most importantly, of course, the impending execution — are also plain to see. Accordingly, we are confident that the need for real expedition in this matter will not in any way compromise the Parties' opportunity to present their observations to the Court.

I will begin Paraguay's oral submissions by setting forth the treaty provisions from which Paraguay's claims arise and the jurisdictional basis for those claims.

My colleague Mr. Legum will then set forth the facts out of which the claims arise.

I will then address the Application for provisional measures in light of the present posture of the dispute.

And finally, Dr. Gorostiaga will briefly elaborate on the importance Paraguay attaches to the interests at stake in this matter.

2. Substantive Treaty Rights at Issue

Paraguay bases its Application in this Court on the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, to which both Paraguay and the United States are parties. The Convention, as this Court well knows, is the modern cornerstone of consular rights and privileges, but it is a cornerstone that rests on centuries of accumulated experience.

Article 5 *(e)* of the Vienna Convention includes protecting the interests of a sending State's nationals and providing consular assistance to nationals of the State as among the consular functions protected by the Convention.

Article 36 implements certain provisions of Article 5 *(e)* in the case of detained nationals. Paragraph 1 of Article 36 provides a detailed procedural mechanism to be followed in all cases where a national is detained by another State party.

Subparagraph *(a)* of paragraph 1 establishes the guiding principle of free consular access — that is, consular officers of the sending State must have free access to and communication with nationals of that State, and nationals must have free access to and communication with their consular officers. That is the very basis of the means by which consular assistance is provided.

Subparagraph *(b)* establishes the precise procedure to be followed when a national of the sending State is detained by the competent authorities of the receiving State. Specifically, the authorities of the receiving State must "without delay" inform the national of his or her right to consular assistance and to have the consul advised of the detention. Further, if the national so requests, the authorities must "without delay" inform the consular post of the sending State. Finally, any communication by the national to the consular

inform the consular post of the sending State. Finally, any communication by the national to the consular post must be forwarded to the authorities, again "without delay".

Subparagraph *(c)* describes the consular officers' procedural rights with respect to detained nationals. They have the right to visit and to correspond and to converse and to arrange for legal representation.

Paragraph 2 of Article 36 provides that all of these rights "shall be exercised in conformity with the laws and regulations of the receiving State". That provision, however, is subject to the proviso that "the said laws and regulations must enable full effect to be given to the purposes for which the rights accorded under the Article are intended". Thus, while States have the authority to regulate the means by which consular rights are exercised, the municipal laws and regulations cannot operate to deprive the consular officers or the national of the rights granted; to the contrary, the proviso — which was adopted over an alternative that would have permitted substantial dilution of the rights granted by way of municipal law requirements — makes clear that the municipal laws must ensure that "full effect" be given to such rights.

I should point out that Article 36 in Paraguay's view creates rights not only for the State party, but also for the detained national.

And as the Court will have noted, Paraguay in this case seeks redress for both categories of rights. It brings the action on its own behalf for violations of rights owed to it, and it also brings the action in the exercise of diplomatic protection in light of the breach of duties owed to its national.

3. Jurisdiction

Finally, the Vienna Convention includes an Optional Protocol, again to which both Paraguay and the United States are parties.

Article I of the Protocol provides that "[d]isputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention shall lie within the compulsory jurisdiction" of this Court, the Application may be brought by any party to the dispute being a party to the Protocol.

I will address jurisdiction more fully after Mr. Legum has advised the Court of the relevant facts. For the moment, I simply wish to point out that Paraguay founds jurisdiction in this case on Article I of the Optional Protocol.

I turn now to Mr. Legum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Donovan. Mr. Legum, please.

Mr. LEGUM:

III. FACTS

1. Introduction

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President and distinguished Members of the Court. I will this morning summarize the facts and proceedings in the United States concerning the case of Angel Francisco Breard.

2. The Crime and the Arrest

Mr. Breard is a Paraguayan national. In 1986, at the age of 20, he left Paraguay to reside in the United

States.

On 1 September 1992, Mr. Breard was arrested by law enforcement authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia, one of the States of the United States. Mr. Breard was suspected to have raped and murdered a Virginia woman named Ruth Dickie.

Neither at the time Mr. Breard was arrested, nor at any point thereafter, did Virginia law enforcement authorities inform him of his right to receive consular assistance from the Paraguayan consulate. Nor did they ever advise the Paraguayan consulate of his detention. Neither the Virginia authorities nor the United States contend otherwise.

The Virginia authorities did not provide Paraguay the opportunity to consult with Mr. Breard and arrange for appropriate legal representation. Instead, the Virginia court itself appointed counsel for Mr. Breard. The lawyers appointed by the court were familiar with the Virginia criminal justice system. They had no familiarity, however, with the justice system or culture of Paraguay and were not equipped to address misconceptions concerning the functioning of the American justice system that a Paraguayan national might be expected to have.

3. The Trial and Sentence

Virginia brought Mr. Breard to trial and determined to seek the death penalty.

As a result of the lack of consular assistance, Mr. Breard made a number of objectively unreasonable decisions during the course of the criminal proceedings against him.

Perhaps most important, he rejected a plea offer that the Virginia authorities made before trial. The Virginia authorities offered to recommend a sentence of life imprisonment if Mr. Breard would plead guilty to the charges against him. Against the advice of his court-appointed attorneys, Mr. Breard rejected that offer.

Instead, Mr. Breard waived his right not to incriminate himself, took the witness stand and confessed to the murders. These actions ruled out any possibility that Mr. Breard would receive an acquittal and subjected him to one of three possible penalties under Virginia law: life imprisonment, life imprisonment with a $100,000 fine against him or the death penalty.

Therefore, in rejecting the plea offer and confessing at trial, Mr. Breard exposed himself to the risk of a death sentence without any possibility of receiving a lighter sentence than what the Virginia authorities had offered to him in the plea offer before trial.

Mr. Breard's decision to confess and reject the plea offer was based on a misunderstanding of the United States justice system and how it differed from the Paraguayan justice system. Where a confession at trial might appeal to the mercy of a Paraguayan court, such a confession in the Virginia trial served only to seal Mr. Breard's fate.

Paraguayan consular officers are familiar with the characteristics of both justice systems, understand the misconceptions of Paraguayan nationals about the United States justice system and are skilled in explaining the differences in terms that Paraguay nationals can understand. Had a Paraguayan consular officer been permitted to assist Mr. Breard, the officer would have provided Mr. Breard with information that would have enabled him to make more informed decisions in the conduct of his defence.

Even with Mr. Breard's confession at trial, the jury found it a close question whether to apply the death penalty. The jury transmitted a note to the trial judge enquiring whether it could sentence Mr. Breard to life in prison and at the same time recommend that he not be released on parole. Because such a sentence was not provided for under Virginia law at the time, the judge did not respond to the note.

At the conclusion of the 1993 trial, the jury found Mr. Breard guilty of the murder, and he was sentenced to death. Had he had the assistance of Paraguayan consular officers, that result would have been

different, at least with respect to the sentence.

4. Post-Conviction

Mr. Breard appealed his conviction and sentence to Virginia's appellate courts. His appeals were denied. He also petitioned the state courts of Virginia for relief from his detention by way of a writ of *habeas corpus*. That petition was also denied.

In sum, Mr. Breard was detained, tried, convicted, sentenced to death and had exhausted all of the remedies available to him in the state courts of Virginia without ever receiving the notification and consular assistance to which he was entitled under Article 36 of the Vienna Convention.

In the spring of 1996, without benefit of information from the authorities of Virginia and the United States, Paraguay finally learned that Mr. Breard was imprisoned in Virginia and awaiting execution. Paraguayan and consular officers immediately began rendering assistance to Mr. Breard. At the time Paraguay first contacted Mr. Breard, he was entirely unaware of his rights under the Vienna Convention. He was unaware of those rights precisely because the authorities of the United States had failed to comply with their obligation to notify him of his rights under the Vienna Convention.

In late August 1996, Mr. Breard took the final step available to him for challenging his conviction and sentence: filing a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* in a federal court of first instance. For the first time, Mr. Breard raised violations of the Vienna Convention.

In November 1996, the federal court of first instance denied Mr. Breard's petition for *habeas corpus*. The court held under the municipal law doctrine of procedural default, Mr. Breard could not assert the violations of the Vienna Convention as a basis relief in the federal *habeas* proceedings because he had not done so in his prior legal proceedings.

The court held the doctrine to bar his Vienna Convention claims even though he had failed to raise those claims not through any choice on his part, but rather because the Virginia authorities had failed to notify him of his rights as required by the Convention.

The intermediate federal appellate court affirmed the lower court's decision on 22 January 1998. This affirmance exhausted all of the municipal law remedies available to Mr. Breard as a matter of right.

In light of the exhaustion of such remedies, by order dated 25 February 1998 the Virginia court that had sentenced Mr. Breard set an execution date of 14 April 1998.

Mr. Breard is scheduled to be moved on Friday 10 April 1998, from the maximum security prison where he is currently incarcerated to the facility in another town of Virginia where the execution chamber is housed. Absent intervention, at 9 p.m. one week from today Virginia will, in the words of the authorizing statute, "cause the prisoner under sentence of death to be electrocuted or injected with a lethal substance until he is dead" (Va. Stat. Ann. ð 53.1 234).

5. Breard's Petition to the Supreme Court

Mr. Breard has now petitioned the United States Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari and requested a stay of his execution.

Several aspects of the procedure in the Supreme Court are important to understand.

First, review in the Supreme Court is not a matter of right but is a matter of discretion rarely exercised. Less than five percent of all petitions for certiorari are granted. The situation is no different in cases involving the death penalty: prisoners facing execution routinely petition the Court and request a stay, and the Court routinely denies.

Second, in cases involving an imminent execution, the Supreme Court typically does not rule on the

petition and request for a stay of execution until shortly before the scheduled execution. Often the decision is communicated telephonically to the petitioner a few hours before the execution.

I now turn to Mr. Donovan to set forth Paraguay's Application for provisional measures.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Legum. Mr. Donovan please.

Mr. DONOVAN:

IV. NEED FOR PROVISIONAL MEASURES

Paraguay asks this Court to direct the United States to ensure that Mr. Breard is not executed until the Court has had the opportunity to rule on Paraguay's claims under the Vienna Convention as presented in its Application instituting proceedings. In Paraguay's view, the impending execution of Mr. Breard on the basis of a criminal proceeding that it is acknowledged by the competent authorities of the United States did not comply with the requirements of the Vienna Convention establishes the need for provisional measures in this case with unusual clarity.

I will set forth Paraguay's Application in four steps. First, I will demonstrate the Court's jurisdiction. Second, we will discuss the relationship of the provisional measures sought to the rights Paraguay seeks to vindicate in this matter in order to show that the measures sought are the minimum necessary to preserve the possibility of an effective final judgment. Third, we will describe the circumstances that establish the urgency of the Application, and finally, I will set forth the basis of Paraguay's claim that it faces irreversible damage.

First, the matter Paraguay brings to this Court is plainly a "dispute arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention". As Mr. Legum explained, neither the United States nor the competent authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia have ever suggested that Virginia officials complied with Article 36 of the Vienna Convention when they prosecuted Mr. Breard for capital murder. Paraguay has sought relief for the violation from the United States for the past 18 months, both through diplomatic channels and — although it was under no obligation to do so — through the municipal court system in the United States.

The United States, however, has taken no steps to remedy the violation. In particular, the United States has taken no steps to halt the impending execution of Paraguay's national on the basis of a conviction and sentence obtained in violation of the Convention. As a result, the parties have a dispute within Article I of the Optional Protocol, and the Court is competent to hear Paraguay's Application.

The Court's authority to go forward on this Application for provisional measures becomes even clearer when one takes into account the principle, which this Court has stated on numerous occasions, that on an application for provisional measures the Court need not finally satisfy itself of its jurisdiction but may — given the very nature of provisional measures — proceed on the basis of a prima facie showing. Paraguay respectfully submits that the existence prima facie of jurisdiction under Article I is clear.

Second, the provisional measures Paraguay seeks are appropriate in light of its claims. Specifically, the measures Paraguay seeks are both *conservatory* and *conservative*.

This Court has often stated that the objective of provisional measures must be to "preserve the respective rights of the parties pending the decision of the Court". Here, Paraguay claims, a violation of Article 36 of the Vienna Convention. Paraguay claims that it suffered injury from that violation in the form of a conviction rendered against, and sentence of death imposed upon, its national.

To remedy the violation, Paraguay seeks restitution in kind and an order of non-repetition.

As to restitution, in the classic formulation of the Chorzow Court, the author of an internationally wrongful act has an obligation "as far as possible, [to] wipe out all the consequences of the illegal act and re-establish the situation which would, in all probability, have existed if that act had not been committed". Article 43 of the ILC's Draft Articles on State Responsibility is to similar effect. In its formulation the injured State is entitled to "the re-establishment of the situation which existed before the wrongful act was committed".

In this case, the re-establishment of the prior situation will require an order against the enforcement of the conviction and sentence. It may also require for example, an order directing that the plea offer which would have permitted Mr. Breard to avoid the death sentence be reconveyed. Obviously, no such orders could have any effect if Virginia has executed Mr. Breard in the meantime.

Likewise, as to non-repetition, Paraguay will seek an order requiring the United States to ensure compliance with the Vienna Convention should Virginia choose to retry Mr. Breard, as Paraguay expects it would. That order, too, would be useless if Mr. Breard has been executed.

Clearly, then, an order directing the United States to ensure that Mr. Breard is not executed during the pendency of this proceeding is necessary to preserve Paraguay's rights in the controversy.

The Court has also stated that provisional measures should not "anticipate" the Court's judgment on the merits. As an initial matter, I should note that the relief that Paraguay seeks on the merits in this case is carefully restrained. Paraguay does not contend that Mr. Breard is not subject to re-trial or to future prosecution for the acts with which he was charged. The fundamental contention of Paraguay is that in any such re-trial Paraguay's rights and Mr. Breard's rights under the Vienna Convention must be respected. Likewise, the provisional measures that Paraguay seeks are carefully limited and in no way anticipate a judgment. Paraguay does not ask, for example, that Mr. Breard be afforded a new trial at this time, or that his conviction and sentence be in any way affected except that the death sentence — the execution — be provisionally suspended. Mr. Breard will remain in custody, and if the United States prevails on the merits in this case, Virginia will be able to go forward with the execution. Thus, the United States can complain of no harm if the Court orders the narrowly tailored provisional measures that Paraguay seeks.

Third, the Court has also said that provisional measures should issue only in situations of urgency. There can be no question of urgency here. As Mr. Legum has explained, neither Paraguay nor this Court can act on the assumption that the Supreme Court will grant a writ of certiorari or stay of the execution in Mr. Breard's case. As we have explained, Paraguay too has sought relief in the municipal courts of the United States. At the moment Paraguay too, in its own right and asserting only its own rights, also has a petition for certiorari pending before the United States Supreme Court and accompanying that petition it has filed an application for a stay of or injunction against the execution. But the same situation that Mr. Legum explained with respect to Mr. Breard's own petition obtains with respect to Paraguay's petition. We believe that the petition is compelling, but we must recognize that the Supreme Court grants very few petitions, and there is no possible way to predict in the case of any individual petition whether or not it will do so.

The nature of the provisional measures that are necessary here, considered in light of the constitutional structure of the United States, adds an additional element of urgency. The order of execution is an order of a State court, that of the Commonwealth of Viriginia. While the United States plainly has the ability to comply with any order the Court may issue by obtaining a stay of the Virginia court's order of execution, it will need to intervene with State authorities in order to do so, and it may, if it is so advised, choose to call upon a federal court. In other words, unlike some other situations, if the Court indicates provisional measures forbidding the execution, the federal executive branch to which any order would first be communicated will need to act affirmatively in order to bring the United States in compliance with that indication of provisional measures. It will not be sufficient for the United States, at least in the form of its federal executive branch, simply to refrain from taking certain action. For that reason there is an additional need, with the greatest respect, for the Court to act quickly.

Finally, this Court has stated that the authority to grant provisional measures "presupposes that irreparable prejudice should not be caused to rights which are the subject of dispute in judicial proceedings". In other words, the Court has required a showing of irreparable injury or irreversible damage in some sense as a predicate to an indication of provisional measures. In Paraguay's view, I need not dwell on this requirement here. Needless to say, death is irreparable, irreversible and, in a very fundamental sense, irremediable. In considering requests from death-row prisoners for stays of their execution, the United States Supreme Court has held, without reservation, that in cases involving an execution, the equitable requirement of irreparable injury in seeking the equitable intervention of a stay or injunction is a given. Now that a death penalty case has reached this Court, it should be no different here.

The crimes with which Mr. Breard are charged deserve the most unequivocal condemnation. On the present state of affairs, individual states of the United States have the authority to express that condemnation in the form of the penalty of death. But even if the death penalty may still be lawfully imposed as a matter of sanction, courts entrusted to uphold the rule of law — on the international level no less than on the municipal level — must be vigilant to ensure the lawfulness, too, of the proceedings by which that penalty is imposed. To exercise that vigilance here, the Court must first indicate to the United States that it must ensure that Paraguay's national is not executed while this case is before the Court.

Dr. Gorostiaga will conclude Paraguay's submissions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Donovan. Dr. Gorostiaga, please.

Mr. GOROSTIAGA:

V. CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Vice-President, Mr. President, and distinguished Members of the Court.

My colleagues have explained the importance of consular assistance in general. I wish very briefly to highlight the importance of consular assistance in this case in particular.

The United States is one of a relatively small group of countries that still impose the death penalty. Paraguay's Constitution, by contrast, expressly forbids the death penalty and guarantees the right to life.

The severity and irreversible nature of the death penalty greatly increase the importance of consular assistance in all cases in which it is sought. There is an enormous qualitative difference between a term of imprisonment and death: a case in which the death penalty is sought against a foreign national implicates to the maximum extent possible the foreign State's interest in protecting its nationals.

Such a case therefore brings into play in the most concrete and immediate way the sending State's right to provide consular assistance.

I wish to conclude by stating that Paraguay, of course, does not condone in any way the violent crime with which Mr. Breard was charged.

Further, Paraguay does not contest in any way the authority of the United States or its constituent entities to enforce its criminal laws with respect to this or any other crime committed within its jurisdiction.

Paraguay does contend, however, that the competent authorities of the United States must enforce its criminal laws by means that comport with the obligations undertaken by the United States in the Vienna

Convention.

That was not done in the case of Angel Breard.

Paraguay today requests that this Court indicate provisional measures to ensure that the possibility will remain for Paraguay to exercise its rights under that Convention in Mr. Breard's case.

Thank you.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Dr. Gorostiaga.

The Court will now adjourn for ten minutes and resume again to hear the submissions of the United States.

The Court adjourned from 11.00 to 11.15 a.m.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Please be seated. The Court now resumes its sitting to hear the submissions of the United States of America.

Mr. ANDREWS: Thank you Mr. President, Members of the Court. Before I begin my presentation I would like to express the pleasure of the United States delegation at seeing Judge Kooijmans again sitting with the Court.

1.1. Mr. President, it is again an honour to appear before the Court, although I regret that it must be in a matter so hurried and involving facts so unhappy as those involved here.

1.2. As the Court well knows, Paraguay filed this case four days ago. Because of Paraguay's decision to file at such a late date, the Court decided to hold a hearing today on Paraguay's request for provisional measures. Out of our respect for the Court, we have of course come here urgently to participate in these proceedings. This morning, we will present our reasons why the Court should not indicate provisional measures. Given the extraordinary haste of these proceedings, however, our presentations will be less fully developed than we would like. We regret the unfortunate circumstances that have led to this expedited proceeding, which prejudices not just the United States, but the ability of the Court to consider the issues before it fully and fairly. We likewise regret the fact that Paraguay has chosen to disregard the two-month period provided in the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention for the possible resolution of such disputes through conciliation or arbitration.

1.3. The facts of the criminal indictment underlying this case are straightforward; indeed, we should all be clear that Mr. Breard unquestionably committed the offences for which he was tried. On 17 February 1992, Mr. Breard attempted to rape and then brutally murdered Ruth Dickie, a woman in Arlington, Virginia, a suburban jurisdiction across the Potomac River from Washington D.C. He was then arrested while attempting another rape. As we shall explain, genetic and other physical evidence linked Mr. Breard to the murder and the attempted rape. Indeed, ample evidence independent of his own testimony existed to prove that Mr. Breard committed these crimes. Mr. Breard was also implicated in a third sexual assault committed before he murdered Ms Dickie.

1.4. The Arlington police took Mr. Breard into custody and charged him with serious offences. The Commonwealth of Virginia has stipulated in United States court proceedings that the "competent authorities" did not inform Breard that, as a national of Paraguay, he was entitled to have Paraguay's

consul notified of his arrest. Under Article 36 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, the police were obliged to tell Mr. Breard that the consul could be so notified.

1.5. Mr. Breard had lived in the United States since 1986 and speaks English well, he was appointed experienced criminal defence counsel, and was able to maintain close and regular contact with friends and family. Given the circumstances and gravity of his crime, the jury recommended that he be sentenced to death, and the judge did so. Thereafter, Mr. Breard's attorneys brought a number of further actions in Virginia state courts and in United States courts seeking reversal of his conviction and sentence. This process has continued for almost five years, involving actions in different courts in the United States, including the United States Supreme Court, where Breard's request for certiorari — in other words, discretionary review by the Supreme Court — is still pending today.

1.6. As this Court knows, the indication of provisional measures is a serious matter which the Court is cautious in exercising. That is especially true in this case, where the Court is being asked to take action that would severely intrude upon the national criminal jurisdiction of a State in a matter of violent crime. Under the Court's jurisprudence, an applicant may only obtain the indication of provisional measures of protection in narrowly-defined circumstances, which the United States submits do not exist here.

1.7. The United States principal submission to the Court is that Paraguay has no legal recognizable claim to the relief it seeks and, for that reason, there is no prima facie basis for jurisdiction for the Court in this case, nor any prospect for Paraguay ultimately to prevail on the merits. Consequently, and in accordance with its jurisprudence, this Court should not indicate provisional measures of protection as requested by Paraguay.

1.8. Paraguay has no legally recognizable claim because Paraguay has no right under the Vienna Convention to have Mr. Breard's conviction and sentence voided. Paraguay in effect asks that this Court grant Mr. Breard a new trial — a right which would then presumably accrue to any other person similarly situated in the United States or in any other State which is a party to the Vienna Convention. The United States will show in these proceedings that this is not the consequence of a lack of notification under the Vienna Convention. The Court should not accept Paraguay's invitation to rewrite the Convention and to become a supreme court of criminal appeals.

1.9. Before describing the manner in which the United States will proceed in its presentation, I feel obliged to make a few comments about the issue of the death penalty in the United States. In a majority of the states of the United States (thirty-eight), including Virginia, voters have chosen through their freely elected officials to retain the death penalty for exceptionally grievous offences. Likewise, the United States itself authorizes the death penalty for exceptionally grievous federal offences. In practice, it is imposed, almost without exception, only for aggravated murder, as well as the case here. In all cases, the death penalty may be carried out only under substantive laws in effect at the time the crime was committed. All convictions and sentences involving the death penalty are subject to the extensive due process and equal protection requirements of the United States Constitution. They are also subject to exhaustive appeals at the state and federal levels, as has been the case with Mr. Breard.

1.10. When carried out in accordance with these safeguards, the death penalty does not violate international law. Capital punishment is not prohibited by customary international law or by any treaty to which the United States is a party. We recognize that some countries have abolished the death penalty under their domestic laws and that some have accepted treaty obligations to that effect. We respect their decisions. However, we also believe that in democratic societies, the criminal justice system, including the punishments prescribed for the most serious crimes, should reflect the will of the people freely expressed and appropriately implemented by their elected representatives. Within the United States, legislative majorities nationally and in most of the constituent states have chosen to retain the option of capital punishment for the most serious crimes.

1.11. Many other countries likewise maintain capital punishment. On the same day that Paraguay filed this case, 3 April, the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva adopted a resolution that encouraged States that have the death penalty to establish a moratorium on executions. This resolution passed, but by a sharply divided vote of 26 in favour and 13 against, with 12 abstaining. This action reflects the

diversity of views held in the international community concerning capital punishment.

1.12. Capital punishment is not the issue in the dispute between the United States and Paraguay. The actual issues are quite different. They are very narrow. They relate to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, to which both the United States and Paraguay are parties.

1.13. As is customary, Mr. President, the United States will not read the full citations that support our arguments, but they are included in the texts provided to the Court and to opposing counsel. Further, I wish to note that the United States reserves the right to make additional arguments regarding issues of jurisdiction or the merits of this case that are not made today for purposes of this proceeding. Our presentation will proceed as follows. Ms Catherine Brown, the Department of State's Assistant Legal Adviser for Consular Affairs, will discuss the nature of the consular function and the practice of States with regard to consular notification and the remedies when notification is not provided. She will also describe in some detail the underlying facts of Mr. Breard's case and the efforts of the United States once it became aware of the case.

1.14. Ms Brown will be followed by Mr. John Crook, the State Department's Assistant Legal Adviser for United Nations Affairs. Mr. Crook will discuss the legal factors that should guide the Court in determining whether it should indicate provisional measures and will apply those factors to this case to show that provisional measures are not warranted. In doing so, he will discuss the text of the Vienna Convention, it negotiating history, and relevant subsequent practice.

1.15. Mr. Matheson, the State Department's Principal Deputy Legal Adviser and Co-Agent in this case, will address additional, prudential reasons for the Court not to issue provisional measures in this case, by noting the problems that would be created were the Court to assume the role asked by Paraguay.

1.16. After Mr. Matheson's presentation, I will return to the podium to provide a brief closing. Thank you, Mr. President. I ask you now to invite Ms Brown to the podium.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Andrews. I give the floor now to Ms Catherine Brown.

Ms BROWN: Mr. President, Members of the Court,

2.1. It is a privilege and honor to be appearing before this Court for the first time.

2.2. My task is to explain to the Court the factual background of this dispute. I will review how the United States has responded to the concerns expressed by the Government of Paraguay, including the results of our investigation into the facts of Mr. Breard's case. First, however, I will address the nature of the consular function and the practice of States with regard to consular notification, in so far as those facts are relevant to the issues of this case.

I. The Consular Function

2.3. The principal function of consular officers is to provide services and assistance to their country's nationals abroad. The Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, to which both the United States and Paraguay are parties, enumerates a wide range of general consular functions in Article 5. Article 36 addresses the specific issue of consular officers communicating with their nationals abroad.

2.4. Article 36, paragraph 1 *(a)*, provides that consular officials shall be free to communicate with their nationals and to have access to them. This case does not involve a deliberate interference with Paraguay's right to communicate with its national, Angel Breard. Moreover, since Paraguayan consular officials became aware of Mr. Breard's detention, they have been able to communicate and visit with him.

2.5. Article 36, paragraph 1 *(b)*, provides that a detained foreign national shall be permitted without delay to communicate with the relevant consular post and that competent authorities will advise the consular post of the foreign national's detention without delay if the detainee so requests. There is no serious question in this case that Mr. Breard could at any time have communicated with a Paraguayan consular official, either directly or through his family or his attorneys, had he known and chosen to do so.

2.6. Article 36, paragraph 1 *(b)*, concludes with the "consular notification" obligation that is at issue in this case: it provides that "the said authorities shall inform the person concerned without delay of his rights under this paragraph". Virginia authorities apparently did not so advise Mr. Breard, at the time of his arrest, or at any time prior to his conviction and sentence, that he could communicate with a consular official. But that does not mean that he was impeded or dissuaded from obtaining consular assistance. He, or his family, or his attorneys, might at any time have enlisted the assistance of a consul, as is frequently the case. The option of calling one's embassy or consul for help is widely known, and many governments advise their own nationals to call their embassy or consul in an emergency abroad.

2.7. Article 36, paragraph 1 *(c)*, provides that consular officials may visit their nationals in detention, converse and correspond with them, and arrange for their legal representation. Again, there was no deliberate effort to interfere with this right, and since becoming aware of Mr. Breard's detention Paraguayan consular officials have been able to visit and communicate with him. With respect to legal representation, arrangements were made by the State of Virginia for two clearly competent lawyers to represent Mr. Breard. Thus a consul proved unnecessary to perform this function.

2.8. Finally, Article 36, paragraph 1 *(c)*, concludes that a consular officer shall refrain from taking action on behalf of a national who is in prison if he expressly opposes such action. This provision is of particular interest here because Mr. Breard did not accept — indeed he adamantly resisted and even rejected — the advice not only of his attorneys, but also of his mother a Paraguayan national.

2.9. Several additional points are noteworthy. First, neither Article 5 nor Article 36 imposes any obligations on consular officers themselves. A consular officer may or may not choose to undertake any particular function on behalf of his countrymen. Consequently, the practice of States — and even of individual consuls — in assisting their nationals varies widely. Some countries are very active, while others are passive or even quite frankly uninterested or unable to provide any significant consular assistance. A country may have just one or two consular officials in a capital city, and none at a more remote location. A country's consular officials may make frequent prison visits or visit only selectively, if at all. Each country decides for itself what it will do. This in turn creates expectations among its nationals as to whether seeking consular assistance would be worthwhile.

2.10. Second, nothing in these Articles elevates the rights of foreign nationals above those of citizens of the host country. A foreign national is expected to obey the host country's laws, and is subject to its criminal justice system. Consular officers assist their nationals within this context. Consistent with this, Article 5 *(i)* of the Vienna Convention limits the rights of consular officers to represent or to arrange representation of their nationals before the tribunals of the receiving State. They may do so only "subject to the practices and procedures obtaining in the receiving State". The United States does not permit foreign consular officials to act as attorneys in the United States, nor may its own consular officers abroad act as attorneys for American citizens. We believe that this is the general practice of States.

2.11. Third, the Vienna Convention does not make consular assistance an essential element of the host country's criminal justice system. This is inevitable, given that consular officers have no obligations to act in any particular way vis-à-vis a host country's criminal justice system. A consul may do nothing at all, leaving the justice system to run its course. Or, the consul may visit the detainee; may ensure that the detainee's family is aware of the detention; may assist the detainee in securing counsel, if necessary; and may follow developments so that any questions about the fairness of the proceedings can, if appropriate, be discussed with host country officials. But the consular officer is not responsible for the defence because he cannot act as an attorney.

II. State Practice With Respect to Consular Notification

2.12. Two additional aspects of state practice are relevant: how faithfully do governments provide notification and what remedies, if any, are provided by governments for failures to notify? Because it is important that the United States respond appropriately to allegations of violations of consular notification, the Department of State recently made inquiries to all of our Embassies and, through them, directly to governments on these matters. While our information remains incomplete, we believe that it fairly reflects the range of state practice.

2.13. Practice with respect to notification: Compliance with respect to the obligation to notify the detainee of the right to see a consul in fact varies widely. At one end of the spectrum, some countries seem to comply unfailingly. At the other end, a small number seem not to comply at all. Rates of compliance seem partly to be a function of such factors as whether a country is large or small, whether it has a unitary or federal organization, the sophistication of its internal communication systems, and the way in which the country has chosen to implement the obligation. Countries have chosen to implement the obligation in different ways, including by providing only oral guidance, by issuing internal directives, and by enacting implementing legislation. Some apparently provide no guidance at all.

2.14. If a detainee requests consular notification or communication, actual notification to a consul may take some time. It may be provided by telephone, but sometimes a letter or a diplomatic note is sent. As a result there may be a significant delay before notification is received and, consequently, critical events in a criminal proceeding may have already occurred before a consul is aware of the detention. And, as noted previously, the consul may then respond in a variety of ways. For these reasons, and because of the wide variation in compliance with the consular notification requirement, it is quite likely that few, if any, states would have agreed to Article 36 if they had understood that a failure to comply with consular notification would require undoing the results of their criminal justice systems.

2.15. Practice with respect to remedies: Let me turn now to what our inquiries revealed about state practice with respect to remedies. Typically when a consular officer learns of a failure of notification, a diplomatic communication is sent protesting the failure. While such correspondence sometimes goes unanswered, more often it is investigated either by the foreign ministry or the involved law enforcement officials. If it is learned that notification in fact was not given, it is common practice for the host government to apologize and to undertake to ensure improved future compliance. We are not aware of any practice of attempting to ascertain whether the failure of notification prejudiced the foreign national in criminal proceedings. This lack of practice is consistent with the fact and common international understanding that consular assistance is not essential to the criminal proceeding against a foreign national.

2.16. Notwithstanding this practice, Paraguay asks that the entire judicial process of the State of Virginia — Mr. Breard's trial, his sentence, and all of the subsequent appeals, which I will review momentarily — be set aside and that he be restored to the position he was in at the time of his arrest because of the failure of notification. Roughly 165 States are parties to the Vienna Convention. Paraguay has not identified *one* that provides such a *status quo ante* remedy of vacating a criminal conviction for a failure of consular notification. Neither has Paraguay identified any country that has an established judicial remedy whereby a foreign government can seek to undo a conviction in its domestic courts based on a failure of notification.

2.17. In the United States today, foreign nationals and the Government of Paraguay are attempting to have our courts recognize such a remedy as a matter of United States domestic law. But if our courts do so, the United States will become, as far as we are aware, the first country in the world to permit such a result. A number of foreign ministries have advised us that this result would certainly or most likely not be possible in their countries.

2.18. It is not difficult to imagine why such remedies do not exist. As noted, consular assistance, unlike legal assistance, is not regarded as a predicate to a criminal proceeding. Moreover, if a failure to advise a detainee of the right of consular notification automatically required undoing a criminal procedure, the result would be absurd. In particular, it would be inconsistent with the wide variation that exists in the

level of consular services provided by different countries. But it would be equally problematic to have a rule that a failure of consular notification required a return to the *status quo ante* only if notification would have led to a different outcome. It would be unworkable for a court to attempt to determine reliably what a consular officer would have done and whether it would have made a difference. Doing so would require access to normally inviolable consular archives and testimony from consular officials notwithstanding their usual privileges and immunities. In this case, for example, one might wish to examine Paraguay's consular instructions and practices as of the time when Mr. Breard was arrested and inquire into the resources then available to Paraguay's consular officers. Surely governments did not intend that such questions become a matter of inquiry in the courts.

III. The United States Response To The Failure of Notification

2.19. Against this background, I would now like to advise the court of the steps taken by the United States relating to this case in an effort to be responsive to Paraguay's concerns.

2.20. The United States received official notice of Mr. Breard's case in April 1996 through a diplomatic note from Paraguay's Embassy in Washington. Significantly, the note did not allege a breach of the Article 36 consular notification obligation. It did not request consultations to discuss the case. It did not ask for any United States government intervention other than to facilitate efforts to obtain information from Virginia, which the Department of State did. The Department later learned, from Mr. Breard's attorneys, that those attorneys were attempting to challenge Mr. Breard's conviction based on an apparent failure of consular notification and litigation brought by Mr. Breard.

2.21. In September 1996, Paraguay filed suit against Virginia in a federal trial court. The suit sought to restore the *status quo ante* for Mr. Breard on the theory that only such action could vindicate Paraguay's governmental rights in consular notification.

The Department of State discussed the case with representatives of Paraguay in October 1996 and later received a request from the Paraguayan Ambassador for assistance in obtaining a new trial for Mr. Breard. That request failed to provide any evidence that consular law or practice would require such a result. Nevertheless, United States officials met with counsel for Paraguay about the matter and gave the issues raised by the suit careful consideration. Ultimately, the United States concluded that Paraguay's remedy for the consular notification failure lay in diplomatic communications with the Department of State. The United States so advised both the court in which Paraguay's case was pending and Paraguay's Ambassador. The United States did not object to Mr. Breard's own efforts to raise the consular notification issues in the courts, but neither did it support them.

2.22. On 3 June 1997, the Department received another letter from the Ambassador. I note that this letter is not referenced in Paraguay's Application to this Court. In it the Ambassador advised that Paraguay thought that the dispute should be resolved in the domestic courts of the United States, and not by this Court, but that Paraguay nevertheless would agree with the United States to come to this Court. This proposal was conditioned: the domestic United States proceedings should be stayed and the United States should waive any jurisdictional objections it might have to the jurisdiction of this Court and the United States should agree to require Virginia to accept this Court's decision. Like Paraguay's previous correspondence, this letter again failed to offer any serious explanation of why the remedy Paraguay was seeking was appropriate.

2.23. The Department of State nevertheless then decided to undertake an investigation into the case. In our investigation, we received the full co-operation of Virginia and we reviewed all facts relevant to the consular notification issue. This included the critical portions of the transcript, including Mr. Breard's testimony and an affidavit from his defence lawyers concerning their efforts on his behalf.

2.24. Through this process, we learned the following relevant facts:

(1) Mr. Breard unquestionably committed the offences for which he was tried. He was

arrested while attempting a rape. Genetic and other physical evidence linked him to the earlier murder and attempted rape of Ruth Dickie. Ample evidence existed to prove that Mr. Breard committed these crimes, entirely independently of his own testimony. Indeed, nothing in Paraguay's submission suggests that Mr. Breard did not commit the crimes for which he was sentenced. Paraguay instead suggests that a consular officer might have persuaded Mr. Breard to make different tactical decisions;

(2) Mr. Breard had almost immediate and thereafter continuing contact with his family. He testified that one of the first phone calls he made at the time of his arrest was to his uncle. His mother and a cousin were involved in his defence, and his mother testified at his trial. Contacting family members is normally one of the first and most important things that a consular officer does when a national is detained, but here consular assistance to accomplish this proved unnecessary;

(3) Mr. Breard first came to the United States 1986 and thus had been resident in the United States for about six years at the time of his arrest. He had been married briefly to an American. This made it difficult to accept Paraguay's contention that Mr. Breard did not understand American culture;

(4) Mr. Breard had a good command of English. His lawyers had no difficulty communicating with him in English. He testified at his trial in English and the transcript of his testimony attests to his command of the language. Mr. Breard told the judge that he had no problems with English and was comfortable speaking it. Moreover, the state would have provided an interpreter had one been needed. Thus, Paraguay's implication that Mr. Breard was tried unfairly in a language he did not understand is demonstrably false. While a consular officer might help interpret for a detained foreign national, such assistance was not needed by Mr. Breard;

(5) Mr. Breard was represented by two criminal defence lawyers experienced in death penalty litigation. They spent at least 400 hours — the equivalent of 50 days — on his case. United States courts subsequently concluded that their legal representation met the requirements of the United States Constitution for the effective assistance of counsel. These attorneys worked closely with Mr. Breard, his mother, a female cousin, and his religious counsellor from jail, who was of Bolivian origin, to prepare his defence. They communicated with Mr. Breard's personal friends to find witnesses who could testify on his behalf. They communicated with persons in Paraguay to find evidence that would assist in his defence. They arranged for the court to appoint three experts to examine Mr. Breard's mental competence, and they obtained his medical records from Paraguay and from Argentina, so as to explore fully the possibility of an insanity defence and to develop mitigation evidence. Paraguay's assertion that it could have paid for witnesses from Paraguay appears irrelevant, because both his mother and cousin came from Paraguay to assist and there is no indication that there were other witnesses who were not used because of financial constraints;

(6) Mr. Breard decided to plead "not guilty" and to testify in both the penalty and sentencing phases of his trial contrary to the advice of his legal counsel and his mother — a strategy that was clearly unwise. This is the principal tactical decision Paraguay asserts it could have changed, but it is clear that Mr. Breard was advised against it by his own lawyers and his mother, yet rejected their advice. He was fully apprised of the risks of his strategy in the context of the American legal system. Access to a consular officer, who would have been less familiar with that system than his own lawyers, would not have made Mr. Breard's tactical decisions more informed;

(7) there is no credible evidence that Mr. Breard's decision to plead "not guilty" and testify was founded on a cultural misunderstanding. He was born and lived his early years in Argentina, he went to Paraguay for his secondary education and then he came to the United States to study English. As noted, he had been in the United States for six years and married

to an American briefly. Significantly, as noted, his mother was also Paraguayan and yet she as a Paraguayan understood the error of his judgment well enough to advise him not to do what he did. And again, finally, his lawyers unequivocally explained to him that his strategy would not work. He signed a statement confirming that he was rejecting their advice and was not afraid of the outcome even if it resulted in a sentence of death;

(8) although Mr. Breard's legal counsel apparently thought that Breard had the opportunity to plead guilty in exchange for a life sentence, at best only very general preliminary discussions were held on this matter and they were never seriously pursued. Virginia officials have advised us that no actual offer of a plea agreement was ever made and that none would have been made, because of the strength of the government's case and the aggravated circumstances of the crime. Virginia would not affirmatively have agreed to a life sentence because under Virginia law a life sentence would have permitted Mr. Breard's future release. Thus Paraguay's assumption that Mr. Breard could have avoided the death penalty through a plea bargain does not withstand scrutiny;

(9) objective evidence indicates that the jury and the judge could easily have decided on the death penalty even if Mr. Breard had not testified. There was evidence that the murder was "aggravated" within the meaning of Virginia law, both by the "vileness" of the particular circumstances surrounding it and by the continuing danger that Mr. Breard posed to the community. This evidence supported imposition of the death penalty under Virginia law and the judge, who had to approve the jury's recommendation, would have known that a life sentence meant the possibility of future release;

(10) finally, Mr. Breard had the full protection of the criminal justice system. In addition to competent court appointed counsel, he had full judicial review. His conviction and sentence were reviewed and sustained by the Virginia trial court and the Virginia Supreme Court, and subsequently by a federal district court and a federal appeals court. The consular notification issue was being raised only after these procedures had been completed, in yet two more entirely separate legal proceedings.

2.25. In July 1997, the Department reported the results of its investigation in a letter to the Ambassador. That also is not referred to in Paraguay's Application to this Court. Because it found no evidence of consular notification or access, the Department expressed deep regret that such notification apparently was not provided to Mr. Breard. The Department advised, however, that there was no basis for concluding that consular assistance would have altered the outcome. It further stated that it saw no appropriate role for this Court.

2.26. Significantly, the Government of Paraguay has never responded to that letter, either to contest its factual assumptions or to address the Department's conclusion that consular notification would not have made a difference. Even so, the United States has continued to have periodic communications and discussions about the case with Paraguay. These discussions included assurances given as recently as February of this year by senior Paraguayan government officials that they recognized that this case was unprecedented and unlikely to succeed. On 30 March, however, Paraguay unexpectedly advised the United States that it would file this suit unless the United States engaged in consultations and stayed Mr. Breard's execution. Still prepared to address in diplomatic channels any issues relating to consular notification, the United States agreed to engage in such consultations. The United States did so even though it was unable to stay the execution — which is in the hands of the United States Supreme Court and the Governor of Virginia — and even though it continues to believe that this Court is not an appropriate forum to address Paraguay's concerns.

2.27. In addition to these specific measures relating to Mr. Breard's case, the United States has also intensified its long-standing efforts to ensure that all federal, state, and local law enforcement officials in the United States are aware of and comply with the consular notification and access requirements of Article 36. Guidance on these requirements has been issued regularly by the Department of State for many years. Recently, however, the Department has issued a new and comprehensive guidance on this subject, along with a pocket-sized reference card for law enforcement officers to carry on the street.

These materials have been personally provided by the Secretary of State to the United States Attorney-General and to the Governor of every state of the United States including, of course, Virginia. They have also been provided by the Department's Legal Adviser, Mr. Andrews, to every state Attorney-General, and they are being disseminated throughout the United States. In addition, the Departments of State and Justice have begun conducting briefings on these issues for state and federal prosecutors, and law enforcement officials, focusing particularly on areas with high concentrations of foreign nationals. Through these and other efforts, the United States is both acting to correct the circumstances that led to the failure of consular notification in Mr. Breard's case and acting in a manner consistent with state practice. Nothing more is required.

2.28. Mr. President, that concludes my factual presentation of the consular issues raised by this case. I thank the Court for its attention and invite it now to call upon Mr. Crook to speak.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mrs. Brown. I call now on Mr. John Crook.

Mr. CROOK:

3.1. Mr. President, Members of the Court, it is again an honour and a pleasure for me to appear before you. My presentation will consider several important legal factors that should guide the Court in determining whether to indicate provisional measures in this case. I will show why, for a number of reasons, the Court should not indicate the measures requested by Paraguay.

I. The Significance of Provisional Measures

3.2. I must begin by underscoring the gravity and importance of the decision now before the Court. As the Court well understands, the indication of provisional measures is a matter of serious consequence. The decisions of this Court clearly show the need for caution before taking such action. This reflects, first of all, the impact on the authority and the responsibility of sovereign States that such measures may have. It also reflects the fact that such measures may be indicated only after hurried and incomplete proceedings, and that is particularly true here where the Court is sitting to hear a case that was filed less than 96 hours ago.

3.3. It is for such reasons that the Court and commentators have stressed the exceptional nature of the Court's provisional measures power. I refer the Court, for example, to its Order in the case concerning *Aegean Sea Continental Shelf (Greece* v. *Turkey), Interim Protection, Order of 11 September 1976, (I.C.J. Reports 1976*, paras. 32 and 11) and, as Mr. Andrews indicated, the citations in all these matters are contained in the transcript we have handed to the Registry. Thoughtful opinions by individual Judges have examined the point in greater detail. I refer you to Judge Shahabuddeen's opinion in the case concerning *Passage Through the Great Belt (Finland* v. *Denmark), Provisional Measures, Order of 29 July, 1991, (I.C.J. Reports 1991*, p. 29); Judge Lachs in the *Aegean Sea Continental Shelf, Interim Protection, Order of 11 September 1976, (I.C.J. Reports 1976*, p. 20); the dissenting opinions of Judges Winiarski and Badwi Pasha in the case concerning the *Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Interim Protection, Order of 5 July, 1951, (I.C.J. Reports 1951*, p. 97) where they observed that "[m]easures of this kind in international law are exceptional in character to an even greater extent than they are in municipal law; they may easily be considered a scarcely tolerable interference in the affairs of a sovereign State". Judge Lachs, I think, well summed up the consequences in his separate opinion in the *Aegean Sea* case: "the Court must take a restrictive view of its powers in dealing with a request for interim measures".

3.4. The basic factors guiding the Court's decision whether or not to use its exceptional power to indicate provisional measures are laid down in the Statute of the Court. Article 41 envisions that the Court will carry out two separate, although inter-related, examinations. In the interests of time, I shall not read Article 41 but I would refer the Court to it, in particular Article 41(1).

3.5. As the Court will see, that text envisions two separate lines of enquiry. First, the Court's decision whether to indicate provisional measures is to be guided by an assessment of the overall context or circumstances of the case before it. Second, any measures to be indicated are of a nature"which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party". I shall consider each of these aspects in turn.

II. Provisional measures are not warranted in these circumstances

3.6. I shall begin by showing how provisional measures are not warranted in these circumstances. Now Article 41 shows that the Court can and should consider the totality of circumstances involved in a case in deciding whether the indication of provisional measures is appropriate. Other members of the United States team are treating some particularly relevant circumstances. The Agent of the United States, Mr. Andrews, briefly addressed issues relating to the timing of this case. He noted the prejudice, both to the United States and to the judicial process, that follows from the Applicant's decision to file its case at the time it chose to do so. Ms Brown described the facts underlying Paraguay's claim, showing how it departs from the realities of international consular practice. She also showed how the failure to inform Mr. Breard of his right to consular access had no bearing on his trial, conviction and sentence. In our next presentation, Mr. Matheson will analyse yet other relevant circumstances, particularly the implications of this case for other States and for the Court.

3.7. My own discussion will be focused on two interrelated aspects of Paraguay's legal claim. First, I will show how the Court does not have jurisdiction to provide the remedy that Paraguay seeks in its Application. Then I will show how, in assessing whether to indicate provisional measures which may substantially prejudice the party against which they are directed, the Court must weigh the nature of the legal claims before it. The Court should not exercise its exceptional power to indicate provisional measures that prejudice the target State, where the moving Party's claims are legally unfounded or are unlikely to prevail.

3.8. Now as I shall show, particularly given the drastic consequences of Paraguay's basic legal claim — that the lack of consular notification invalidates each and every subsequent conviction of any alien in any State party to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations — that claim should not prevail. Neither the Convention's language, nor its history, nor State practice supports it.

No Jurisdiction.

3.9. Because of the fundamental flaws that undermine Paraguay's claim for relief, the Court has no jurisdictional basis for the measures now requested. Now admittedly, the showing of jurisdiction at the stage of preliminary measures is less substantial than is required at later stages of the case. As the Court recently summarised in its Application of the Genocide Convention Order

> "[O]n a request for provisional measures, the Court need not, before deciding whether or not to indicate them, finally satisfy itself that it has jurisdiction on the merits of the case, yet it ought not to indicate such measures unless the provisions invoked by the Applicant . . . appear, prima facie, to afford a basis on which jurisdiction of the Court might be established." (*Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Provisional Measures, Order of 8 April 1993, I.C.J. Reports 1993*, p. 11, para. 14.)

Although the burden of showing jurisdiction is lower now than it will be at later stages of this case, the Applicant still has a burden to meet. Paraguay has not met that burden.

3.10. Article I of the Optional Disputes Settlement Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations gives the Court jurisdiction over disputes arising out of the "interpretation or application" of the Convention. However, there is no dispute here about either the interpretation or the application of the Convention. The Parties do not disagree on what it means to "inform" a foreign national of his rights under Article 36, paragraph 1 *(b)*, of the Convention. Nor do they dispute that Mr. Breard was not so

informed.

3.11. Instead, Paraguay's claim in this case, in essence, is that under the Vienna Convention the Court can void Mr. Breard's criminal conviction and sentence, and require that he be given a new trial. As I will show, the Vienna Convention does not provide for such an extraordinary form of relief. Paraguay may object to the appropriateness of a criminal conviction and sentence under United States law and practice, but this is not a dispute about the interpretation or application of the Vienna Convention.

3.12. Paraguay tries to meet this difficulty by invoking the doctrine of *restitutio in integrum* (Paraguay's Application, p. 11, para. 25). Paraguay cannot, however, create a right that does not otherwise exist under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations — the Court's sole basis for jurisdiction in this case — simply by invoking a general principle of the law on reparation. Paraguay has failed to make a prima facie showing that the Court has jurisdiction to grant the exceptional relief it seeks here. Under the circumstances, under the Court's well-settled jurisprudence, there is no jurisdictional basis for the Court to indicate provisional measures.

3.13. In this respect, this situation is similar to that faced by the Court in the provisional measures phase of the *Lockerbie* case (case concerning *Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971 Montreal Convention arising from the Aerial Incident at Lockerbie, Order, 14 April 1992,* Request for the Indication of Provisional Measures, para. 43) There, the Court found, as a prima facie matter, that there was no legal basis for the Libyan claim under the Montreal Convention because of the adoption of a resolution of the Security Council. The Court therefore rejected Libya's request for provisional measures because "the rights claimed . . . under the Montreal Convention cannot now be regarded as appropriate for protection by the indication of provisional measures". In a similar way here, there is no legal basis for the rights that are claimed by Paraguay. Those claims too are not an appropriate basis for the indication of provisional measures.

The Merits of Paraguay's Claim.

3.14. Obviously, the Court cannot consider the merits at this stage in a case that is 96 hours' old. Nevertheless, in addition to assessing whether it has jurisdiction to proceed, the Court must weigh the totality of circumstances bearing on Paraguay's request for preliminary measures. In so doing, the Court must consider the doubtful nature of the core legal proposition that Paraguay is advancing — that the Convention requires the invalidation of every conviction and sentence of any person who has not received consular notification required by the Convention.

3.15. The difficulties with Paraguay's legal position must be confronted at this stage, and this ought to be an important element in assessing the appropriateness of provisional measures. As Dumbauld wrote at the time of the Permanent Court, "if it is apparent that the applicant cannot succeed in his main action, preliminary relief will of course be denied" (Edward Dumbauld, *Interim Measures of Protection in International Controversies* 165 (1932).

A. Plain Meaning of the Text

3.16. What are the legal difficulties? To begin with, Paraguay's claim conflicts with the plain meaning of the text. Absolutely nothing in the language of Article 36, paragraph 1, of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (or in any other Article of the Convention) offers support for Paraguay's claim that failure of consular notification requires invalidation of any subsequent conviction and sentence of an alien.

3.17. Paraguay's claims follow from Article 36, paragraph 1, of the Vienna Convention, to which both the United States and Paraguay are parties. Article 36 establishes the basic régime for consular assistance to nationals who may be detailed in the receiving State.

Article 36, paragraph 1, provides:

"1. With a view to facilitating the exercise of consular functions relating to nationals of the

sending State:

> *(a)* consular officers shall be free to communicate with nationals of the sending State and to have access to them. Nationals of the sending State shall have the same freedom with respect to communication with and access to consular officers of the sending State;
>
> *(b)* if he so requests, the competent authorities of the receiving State shall, without delay, inform the consular post of the sending State if, within its consular district, a national of that State is arrested or committed to prison or to custody pending trial or is detained in any other manner. Any communication addressed to the consular post by the person arrested . . . shall also be forwarded to the said authorities without delay. The said authorities shall inform the person concerned without delay of his rights under this subparagraph."

3.18. Mr. President, as was described by Ms Brown, when the competent federal authorities learned that Mr. Breard may not have been told when he was arrested that Paraguay's consul could be notified, the United States authorities investigated thoroughly. When they concluded that a violation of Article 36, paragraph 1, probably had occurred, they took action in co-operation with the Commonwealth of Virginia to try to prevent any recurrence. Senior United States officials apologized to Paraguay, and offered further consultations. As Ms Brown just noted, when Paraguay recently proposed that the two sides enter into formal consultations, the United States promptly agreed to that proposal. Unfortunately, however, and notwithstanding Article II of the Optional Disputes Settlement Protocol to the Convention, Paraguay chose to bring its action here instead.

3.19. Thus, there is no legal dispute between the United States and Paraguay regarding the need to give notification as provided for under Article 36, that such notification was not given, and concerning the need to take effective steps to prevent recurrence. The sole issue concerns the consequences under international law if an arrested alien is not told that his consul can be notified. The United States contends that the solution to such a breach of the treaty's requirements is to be pursued through normal processes of diplomatic apology, consultation and improved implementation.

3.20. Paraguay, however, asks this Court to impose much more drastic consequences. Paraguay's Application maintains that the necessary legal consequence for any such breach is that the ensuing conviction and sentence must be put aside. There is absolutely no support for this claim in the language of the Convention. The Court should not read into a clear and nearly universal multilateral instrument such a substantial and potentially disruptive additional obligation that has no support in the language agreed by the parties.

3.21. Mr. President, there are very few situations in which States actually have agreed by treaty that the failure to observe specific standards can be the basis for appeal to an international tribunal for possible reversal of a conviction or sentence. I have in mind here, for example, regional instruments and institutions such as the European Convention on Human Rights and the Strasbourg Court. Where States have elected to create such mechanisms, they have done so expressly and with great precision. They have not created such additional remedies by indirection or implication, as Paraguay asks the Court do here. Let me return to the negotiating history.

B. Negotiating History

3.22. Likewise, there is no support for Paraguay's claim there. We know of nothing in the history — and Paraguay has pointed to nothing — even hinting that the Parties intended failure to comply with Article 36, paragraph 1, to invalidate subsequent criminal proceedings.

3.23. The Vienna Convention was negotiated on the basis of draft articles prepared by the International Law Commission. The relevant ILC proposals do not contain the obligation to inform an arrested person that their consul could be notified. That was added at the Conference. We have found nothing in the

debates of the conference supporting Paraguay's claim, but there are a number of indications to the contrary.

3.24. Article 36 was negotiated with great difficulty at the Vienna Conference. The final version was only agreed upon two days before the Conference ended. Some delegations supported the ILC's initial draft of Article 36, which would have required that receiving States automatically notify sending States' consuls if a national was arrested. A large number of other States strongly opposed this requirement. They argued, among other things, that it would impose an excessive administrative burden on the receiving State and that the national might not want his government authorities to know about his arrest. (Luke T. Lee, *Consular Law and Practice* (1990), pp. 138-139.)

3.25. Ultimately, a compromise had to be reached. The compromise involved a series of amendments to the ILC draft. I will not try to trace all of these for you, but I will mention one because it helps to show that States at the Conference clearly did not intend that failure of consular notification would invalidate subsequent legal proceedings. The negotiations began with the ILC draft providing for consular notification in the case of arrest. That was widely criticized as unreasonably burdensome and impractical. Accordingly, various narrowing amendments were offered by groups of countries.

3.26. One, offered by Egypt and accepted by the Conference, changed the initial language to state that the obligation to inform the sending State only arises if the national so requests. The delegate of Egypt explained his amendment as follows:

> "The purpose of the amendment is to lessen the burden on the authorities of receiving States, especially those which had large numbers of resident aliens or which received many tourists and visitors. *The language proposed in the joint amendment would ensure that the authorities of the receiving State would not be blamed if, owing to the pressure of work or other circumstances, there was a failure to report the arrest of a national of the sending State.*" (Twentieth Plenary Meeting on 20 April, 1963, United Nations Conference on Consular Relations, Official Records, p. 82, at para 62. Emphasis added.)

The explanation of this amendment (which was adopted by the Conference) clearly suggests that the Conference saw the normal processes of diplomatic adjustment as the means to address failure of a notification requirement. The Conference did not foresee that defects of consular notification would result in the invalidation of subsequent criminal proceedings. Had the parties thought so, the many States that already expressed fears about the burden of the notification requirement would surely have voted down the text that is before you today.

3.27. Other statements during the Conference reinforce that the Parties did not intend the Convention to alter the operation of domestic criminal proceedings. The delegate from the USSR stated that "the matters dealt with in Article 36 were connected with the criminal law and procedure of the receiving State, which were outside the scope for the codification of consular law" (*ibid.*, p. 40, para. 3). The delegate from Belarus expressed similar views, noting that "the Conference was drafting a consular convention, not an international penal code, and it had no right to attempt to dictate the penal codes of sovereign States" (*ibid.*, p. 40, para. 8). Such statements directly conflict with Paraguay's claim today. Thus, the negotiating history does not support Paraguay's broad view of the consequences of non-compliance with Article 36, and a variety of statements made during the debate support a contrary view.

C. State Practice

3.28. Likewise, there is no support in state practice for Paraguay's position. As Ms Brown explained, after the Breard case initially came to the attention of the United States federal authorities, the United States Department of State surveyed the practice of the States parties to the Vienna Convention. That survey found no State — none — that adopted the position Paraguay urges on the Court here. Paraguay has referred to no such State practice here.

3.29. The few national court cases that we know have considered the matter have not reached the result

urged by Paraguay. Lee's treatise *Consular Law and Practice* cites an Italian case where the Italian authorities failed to provide the required consular notice to Yater, a British national. According to Lee, the challenge to Yater's conviction was rejected.

> "The Supreme Court *(Cassazione)* held that the consular role in assisting the defence of his fellow nationals under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations is of 'a complementary and subsidiary nature, and does not replace the right of the accused to make his own arrangements for his own defence'. Since Yater in this case had adequately defended himself during proceedings through a lawyer chosen by him, the plea was dismissed." (Luke Lee, *Consular Law amd Practice* p. 150-151, citing *Cassazione*, 19 Feb. 1973, *re Yater*. Summary and Commentary in 2 *Italian Yb. Int'l L.* 336-9 (1976).)

The issue also has been energetically litigated in United States courts. Indeed, Mr. Donovan, the distinguished counsel for Paraguay, has been a prominent participant in litigation in the United States urging that this approach be adopted as a matter of United States domestic law. However, no United States court has found that the failure of consular notification, standing alone, constitutes a sufficient basis for invalidating a sentence and conviction.

D. No Injury to Mr. Breard

3.30. Finally, as Ms Brown has explained, the notion that Mr. Breard suffered injury because of any failure of consular notification is speculative and unpersuasive. Paraguay's Application asks this Court to indicate provisional measures largely on the basis of some bold assumptions about what Paraguay's consul might have done. In doing so, the Application presents an inflated and unrealistic description of a consul's functions in criminal matters. A consul is not a defence attorney. Consular protection does not immunize a national from local criminal jurisdiction. What a consul can do is help arrested persons arrange means for their own defence. A consul can notify an arrested person's family, or help to ensure that the defendant has local defence attorneys. A consul does not typically retain lawyers to defend her nationals; the United States does not do so, and Paraguay has not established that it normally does so either.

3.31. But, as we have shown, Mr. Breard was able to accomplish all these things quite effectively without the assistance of Paraguay's counsel without the assistance of Paraguay's consul. He spoke English and had lived in the United States since 1986. After his arrest, he was in regular contact with his family. He was defended by able attorneys throughout his trial and the many subsequent legal proceedings. A consul could not have done more to enhance the effectiveness of Mr. Breard's legal defence.

E. Conclusion

3.32. For all of these reasons — the lack of any textual basis in the Convention, the lack of support in the negotiating history and State practice, and the absence of injury to Mr. Breard — Paraguay's basic claim in these proceedings lacks legal foundation. Because there is no basis for the remedy Paraguay seeks in the Convention, the Court lacks jurisdiction. The weakness of Paraguay's legal claim is also a compelling reason for declining to indicate provisional measures.

III. Provisional Measures and The Rights of the Parties

3.33. Mr. President, my final section, will be relatively brief. I will first address the role of provisional measures in relation to the protection of the rights of the Parties. I will explain why such measures should not be indicated in a form that would create a selective or unjust balance with regard to the Parties. I will then show how, in deciding whether to indicate particular provisional measures, the Court must consider whether those measures improperly prejudge the outcome of the dispute.

3.34. Mr. President, the provisional measures sought by Paraguay amount to a determination on the

merits of this case. If the measures sought by Paraguay are indicated and implemented, Paraguay will have won, at least for a period of however many years may be required for the Court to arrive with its final judgment. Paraguay will have advanced its key objective through a hurried and unbalanced proceeding that cannot adequately address the serious legal issues that are at stake.

3.35. This cannot be reconciled with the régime for provisional measures envisioned under Article 41 of the Statute. Article 41 says that the Court may indicate, where circumstances require, "any provisional measures which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party". Take note: "the respective rights of either party". Provisional measures should not protect the rights of one party, while disregarding the rights of the other. But that is precisely what is requested here. As Paraguay has made clear, its goal here is to prevent the operation of the criminal laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia. It seeks to do so where there is no doubt that the accused committed very grave and violent offences, and where there have already been five years of extensive appellate litigation in national courts. As Mr. Matheson will elaborate in our next presentation, this would significantly impair the rights of the United States to the orderly and conclusive functioning of its criminal justice system.

3.36. Moreover, provisional measures should not be indicated in terms or in circumstances where they constitute a disguised adjudication on the merits. Professor Rosenne makes this point strongly in his remarkable new treatise:

> "The power to indicate provisional measures cannot be invoked if its effect would be to grant to the applicant an interim judgment in favour of all or part of the claim formulated in the document instituting proceedings." (Shabtai Rosenne, *The Law And Practice of the International Court, 1920-1996*. Vol. III, p. 1456.)

Nevertheless, this is precisely what Paraguay seeks. Paraguay is asking this Court for a concealed adjudication on the merits of this case through the guise of provisional measures.

3.37. This is exactly the type of case Judge Oda warned of in his recent essay on provisional measures. As he wrote:

> "In recent cases, the actual matters to be considered during the merits phase have been made the object of the requested provisional measures . . . [T]he applicant States appear to have aimed at obtained interim judgments that would have affirmed their own rights and preshaped the main case." (Oda, "Provisional Measures. The Practice of the International Court of Justice," *in Fifty Years of the International Court of Justice. Essays in Honour of Sir Robert Jennings*, Lowe and Fitzmauice, eds., p. 553.)

3.38. Judge Oda goes on to warns of the implications of this, and of the possibility that:

> "the Court . . . be tempted to deliver an interim judgment under the name of provisional measures . . . If the tendency is to be for the Court to arrive at a quick decision on matters relating to the merits, while reserving for the future other much more judicious consideration on the question of jurisdiction as well as the merits . . ., then the whole matter requires very careful consideration." (*Ibid.*, p. 554.)

3.39. Mr. President, Judge Oda is right to be concerned, this whole matter does require very careful consideration. Provisional measures should not be used as a vehicle for a hasty and legally unjustified decision on the merits of Paraguay's claim. And thus, for all of the reasons I have indicated — because of the lack of jurisdiction, because Paraguay's claim is unsound in law, and because the requested provisional measures are unbalanced and improperly prejudge the merits, the Court should reject Paraguay's request.

3.40. I thank the Court for its attention during a long presentation. I now ask that it invite Mr. Michael Matheson, Principal Deputy Legal Adviser, to present the next section of our argument.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Crook. Mr. Matheson has the floor.

Mr. MATHESON:

4.1. Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Court, it is once again my great honour and privilege to appear before you on behalf of the United States. Mr. Crook has explained the basis for our contention that the provisional measures sought by Paraguay are not within the jurisdiction of the Court and lack any legal foundation. I will now explain the reasons for our view that the granting of the provisional measures sought by Paraguay would be contrary to the interests of the parties to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, the international community as a whole, and the Court as well.

4.2. Article 41 of the Statute of the Court provides in part that the Court "shall have the power to indicate, if it considers that circumstances so require, any provisional measures which ought to be taken . . .". This language clearly indicates that the Court may or may not choose to exercise this power in a particular case, depending on whether it believes the circumstances require it and whether it believes the particular measures proposed ought to be taken. (See, for example, *Aegean Sea Continental Shelf, Interim Protection, Order of 11 September 1976*, separate opinion of President Jiménez de Aréchaga, p. 16.)

4.3. It follows from this that the Court should only grant provisional measures where it is satisfied that this would not only be fair and beneficial to the parties to the immediate dispute, but also would be consistent with the proper role of the Court, the interests of the Parties to the convention in question, and the good of the general international community.

4.4. In the present case, Paraguay has asked the Court to suspend decisions of the criminal courts of a State. To our knowledge, this is the first occasion on which the Court has been asked to do so. In its request for provisional measures, Paraguay has asked the Court, in a matter of a few days, to scrutinize and suspend for an indefinite period the considered decisions of the trial and appellate courts of Virginia and the United States — decisions that have been taken after extensive judicial proceedings over a period of years.

4.5. This would be a very serious step, and one which could threaten serious disruption of the criminal justice systems of the parties to the Vienna Convention, and of the work of this Court as well.

4.6. There are currently over 160 parties to the Vienna Convention, of which over 50 have adhered to the Optional Protocol on Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. The Parties to the Protocol include a number of populous States, such as France, Germany, India, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States, where very large numbers of foreign nationals have immigrated or travelled for various reasons. It is inevitable that a significant number of crimes will occur in any population group of such a size, and in fact this has occurred. It is also to be expected that in a number of these cases, law enforcement authorities may commit, or be alleged to have committed, errors in the process of consular notification called for under the Vienna Convention.

4.7. The question is not whether such errors should be remedied. Rather, it is whether this should be left to the diplomatic process and to the domestic criminal authorities of the State in question, or whether this Court should assume the role of a supreme court of criminal appeals to deal with such cases by staying, reviewing and reversing domestic court decisions. Once the Court opens itself to this process, it can be expected that a great many defendants will press the States of their nationality to take recourse to it. This would include not only those who received no consular notification at all, but also those who may wish to claim that the notification received was deficient, incomplete, or tardy. It would include not only those who were genuinely prejudiced by the failure of consular notification, but also those who suffered little or no prejudice because they were nonetheless accorded full assistance of competent counsel and all the requirements of due process.

4.8. In principle, if such a remedy were available for violations of the Vienna Convention, why would it not also be available for alleged violations of other conventions when committed against foreign nationals in detention for criminal offenses, such as bilateral treaties with provisions for consular protection, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, or other agreements with provisions concerning rights to be accorded to aliens or to any person accused of criminal offences? If States may ask this Court to stay executions and nullify convictions on the basis of violations of the Vienna Convention, would they not feel able to do so under these other agreements as well?

4.9. It is difficult to believe that the parties to these conventions really intended that this Court serve as a supreme court of criminal appeals in this manner. It is difficult to believe that they intended to subject their domestic criminal proceedings, which typically include both trial proceedings and one or more levels of appellate review, to yet another stage of review by an international tribunal. As Mr. Crook demonstrated, we know this was not the case with respect to the Vienna Convention. We also know that such a role was not contemplated by the framers of the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the Court.

4.10. Yet this is precisely the message that the Court would give in granting the provisional measures sought by Paraguay in the present case. Delay of the execution of Mr. Breard until the Court's final disposition of the case, as Paraguay requests, would in practice mean the suspension of domestic criminal proceedings for years, whatever the final outcome. Many other defendants in many States could be expected to demand the same treatment, whether the alleged violations were serious or minor, and whether or not those violations led to any significant failures of due process in their conviction.

4.11. In other words, the indefinite stay of execution requested by Paraguay would not be a minor measure that simply preserves the status quo. It would be a major and unprecedented intrusion by the Court into the domestic criminal process that could have far-reaching and serious effects on the administration of justice in many States, and on the role and functioning of the Court.

4.12. All States have compelling interests in the orderly administration and finality of their criminal justice systems, particularly with respect to heinous crimes of the type committed by Mr. Breard. All States have compelling interests in avoiding external judicial intervention that would interfere with the execution of a sentence that has been affirmed following an orderly judicial process meeting all relevant human rights standards.

4.13. We submit that the Court should not take a step having such potentially far-reaching consequences on the basis of a few days of hurried consideration of a suit filed at the very last moment. Before taking any action to intrude into the criminal process of a State, the Court should require Paraguay to show that it does indeed have a basis for its claim in accordance with the normal, orderly process of full proceedings under Part III of the Rules of Court. In this connection, the Court should go through the process called for by Article 63 of the Statute of the Court, which calls for notification of all States parties to the Vienna Convention so as to afford them the possibility of intervention or other submission of views to protect their own vital interests in the interpretation and application of the Convention.

4.14. Given these compelling reasons for refraining from the provisional measures sought, has Paraguay identified any basis for justifying such an extraordinary remedy? We maintain that this is not the case, since Paraguay has shown nothing to indicate that consular notification would have changed the result of the Breard case.

4.15. Neither Mr. Breard's guilt nor the heinous nature of his crime is at issue; he freely confessed in open court that he had committed the offence. In any case, his guilt was thoroughly established by compelling material evidence. Paraguay has not taken issue with this in its Application or in its argument this morning. There is no question of the execution of an innocent man.

4.16. Nor is there any evidence that Mr. Breard was prejudiced in any way by the apparent lack of consular notification. He had lived in the United States for six years and spoke English well. He understood the proceedings being conducted and participated actively in his own defence. He had full contact with his family and with persons in Paraguay. He had competent counsel well versed in the

criminal law of Virginia. He was directly and strongly advised by his attorneys to refrain from the incriminating testimony which he insisted on giving. His conviction was reviewed and upheld by appellate courts of the United States and Virginia.

4.17. Paraguay's contention that the involvement of Paraguayan consular officials would have changed all this is nothing more than imaginative, but wholly unsubstantiated, and implausible speculation. The Court should not engage in an unprecedented intervention in the domestic criminal proceedings of a State on the basis of such implausible speculation. What a domestic appellate court would not do, this Court *a fortiori* should not do. This Court should not serve as a supreme court of criminal appeals in derogation of the normal operation of domestic criminal courts.

4.18. On the other hand, we fully recognize that Paraguay has a legitimate interest in ensuring that the provisions of the Vienna Convention are properly observed and that there is not arecurrence of the apparent failure of consular notification in the Breard case. Therefore, as Ms Brown described, the United States has taken extensive measures to ensure future compliance by State and local authorities.

4.19. Further, when Paraguay requested bilateral consultations under the Convention, the United States promptly agreed to consultations on all issues raised by the Breard case. We were specifically ready to discuss the possible procedural steps provided for in Articles II and III of the Protocol concerning conciliation and arbitration. However, Paraguay insisted on an immediate stay of execution as a precondition to refraining from immediate recourse to this Court, which the United States was not in a position to grant. The United States nonetheless remains prepared to engage in bilateral consultations aimed at encouraging more effective implementation of this Convention by both Parties.

4.20. Mr. President, for all these reasons, we believe that the granting of provisional measures sought by Paraguay would have serious negative consequences for the Parties to the Vienna Convention, for the Court, and for the international community as a whole. We urge the Court not to take such a step, and certainly not after only a few days to consider the implications of such an action. We therefore encourage and urge the Court to exercise its power to deny the measures requested by Paraguay.

4.21. Once again, I thank the Court for its attention and consideration of these arguments. I now suggest that the Court recognize the Agent of the United States, Mr. Andrews, to conclude the argument of the United States and to present its Final Submission. Thank you Sir.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Matheson. I call on Mr. Andrews, Agent of the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS:

5.1. Mr. President, this morning the Court asked the Government of Paraguay to provide copies of two letters, one dated 10 December 1996 and one dated 3 June 1997. We would be pleased to provide the unanswered 7 July 1997 letter that the State Department sent to the Government of Paraguay, which was referenced by Ms Brown in her presentation. Mr. President and Members of the Court, this concludes the presentation of the United States. The submission of the United States is as follows: "That the Court reject the request of the Government of Paraguay for the indication of provisional measures of protection, and not to indicate any such measures".

5.2. We thank the Court for its kind attention to our presentations and its consideration of our arguments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Andrews. Both Parties have now concluded the first round of their oral pleadings. The Court will adjourn now and resume at 3.00 p.m. to afford both Parties an opportunity to reflect. The Court stands adjourned until 3.00 p.m.

The Court rose at 12.50 p.m.

Uncorrected

Non-corrigé

CR 98/8

International Court of Justice

THE HAGUE

Cour internationale de Justice

LA HAYE

YEAR 1998

Public sitting

held on Tuesday 7 April 1998, at 3 p.m., at the Peace Palace,

Vice-President Weeramantry, Acting President, presiding

in the case concerning the Application of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (Paraguay v. United States of America)

Request for the Indication of Provisional Measures

VERBATIM RECORD

ANNEE 1998

Audience publique

tenue le mardi 7 avril 1998, à 15 heures, au Palais de la Paix,

sous la présidence de M. Weeramantry, vice-président, faisant fonction de président

en l'affaire de l'Application de la convention de Vienne sur les relations consulaires (Paraguay c. Etats-Unis d'Amérique)

Demande en indication de mesures conservatoires

COMPTE RENDU

Present:	Vice-President	Weeramantry, Acting President	*Présents :*	M.	Weeramantry, vice-président, faisant fonction de président en l'affaire
	President	Schwebel		M.	Schwebel, president
	Judges	Oda		MM.	Oda
		Bedjaoui			Bedjaoui
		Guillaume			Guillaume
		Ranjeva			Ranjeva
		Herczegh			Herczegh
		Shi			Shi
		Fleischhauer			Fleischhauer
		Koroma			Koroma
		Vereshchetin			Vereshchetin
		Higgins		Mme	Higgins
		Parra-Aranguren		MM.	Parra-Aranguren
		Kooijmans			Kooijmans
		Rezek			Rezek,
	Registrar,	Valencia-Ospina		M.	Valencia-Ospina, greffier

The Government of the Republic of Paraguay is represented by:

H. E. Mr. Manuel María Cáceres, Ambassador of the Republic of Paraguay to the Kingdom of Belgium and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Brussels,

as Agent;

Mr. Donald Francis Donovan, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. Barton Legum, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. Don Malone, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. José Emilio Gorostiaga, Professor of Law at the University of Paraguay in Asunción and Legal Counsel to the Office of the President of Paraguay,

as Counsel and Advocates.

Le Gouvernement de la République du Paraguay est représenté par:

S. Exc. M. Manuel María Cáceres, ambassadeur du Paraguay au Royaume de Belgique et au Royaume des Pays-Bas, à Bruxelles,

comme agent;

M. Donald Francis Donovan, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. Barton Legum, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. Don Malone, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. José Emilio Gorostiaga, professeur de droit à l'Université du Paraguay à Asunción et conseiller juridique de la Présidence du Paraguay,

comme conseils et avocats.

The Government of the United States of America is represented by:

Mr. David R. Andrews, Legal Adviser, United States Department of State,

as Agent;

Mr. Michael J. Matheson, Deputy Legal Adviser, United States Department of State,

as Co-Agent;

Mr. John R. Crook, Assistant Legal Adviser for United Nations Affairs, United States Department of State

Ms. Catherine Brown, Assistant Legal Adviser for Consular Affairs, United States Department of State

as Counsel and Advocates;

Mr. Sean D. Murphy, Legal Counsellor, United States Embassy, The Hague,

Mr. Robert J. Ericson, United States Department of Justice,

as Counsel.

Le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique est représenté par:

M. David R. Andrews, conseiller juridique du département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme agent;

M. Michael J. Matheson, conseiller juridique adjoint principal du département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme coagent;

M. John R. Crook, conseiller juridique adjoint chargé des questions concernant les Nations Unies au département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

Mme Catherine Brown, conseiller juridique adjoint chargé des affaires consulaires au département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme conseils et avocats;

M. Sean D. Murphy, conseiller juridique à l'ambassade des Etats-Unis, La Haye,

M. Robert J. Ericson, du département de la justice des Etats-Unis,

comme conseils.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Please be seated. The Court resumes its sessions to hear the second round of oral submissions and I give the floor now to His Excellency Mr. Cáceres of Paraguay.

Mr. CACERES: Thank you Mr. President. I would like to ask the Court to call upon Mr. Donovan to offer Paraguay's rebuttal. Thank you.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr. Donovan, please.

Mr. DONOVAN: Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President, distinguished Members of the Court.

It would be useful, I believe, to start this afternoon's session by summarizing where the Parties stand in light of this morning's submissions.

First, there is no dispute about the terms of the governing texts, Articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention.

Second, there is no dispute on the basis of the United States submissions this morning that the duties owed under the Vienna Convention to Paraguay and to its national were not fulfilled by the competent authorities of the United States, and hence, that there was a violation of the Treaty. Third, there is no dispute about the generally applicable principle of restitution, that is that the author of an offending illegal act has the obligation to restore the prior situation.

Fourth, there is no dispute between the Parties that the object of provisional measures is to preserve the Parties' rights so that the Court will be in a position, upon rendering final judgment, to render an effective final judgment, a judgment that means something.

Fifth and perhaps most importantly, there is no dispute that unless this Court orders provisional measures, Mr. Breard, Paraguay's national, will be executed on Tuesday 14 April. In Paraguay's, view these points of agreement standing alone not only support an indication of provisional measures in accord with the Court's cases and governing Statute but compel one. Nevertheless, we would like to briefly address several of the other points made by the United States this morning.

First, with respect to jurisdiction. The United States appears to contest the Court's jurisdiction on two converse grounds. On the one hand, the United States argues, it is plain, indeed the United States concedes, that there was a violation here. While on the other hand, the United States argues, it is just as plain that the Vienna Convention affords no effective remedy for that violation. We of course agree that there was a violation, we of course disagree that there is no effective remedy but in any event, neither of these arguments can defeat the Court's jurisdiction in this case.

May I explain? There are at least two reasons why the United States concession that there was a violation here of Article 36 cannot deprive this Court of jurisdiction over the dispute. The first was well stated by the United States in its oral arguments before this Court in the Tehran hostages case. There the United States thought it prudent to address the argument, or the possible argument, that given that there was no possible legal justification for the actions by Iran of which the United States complained in that case, there might not be a dispute between the Parties coming within the Optional Protocol. And if the Court will permit me, I would remind the Court that one of the treaties on which the United States founded its claims in that case was the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and one of the bases of jurisdiction was indeed the Optional Protocol on which Paraguay founded this case.

The United States described that argument, or any such argument, as specious. It said "the sum and substance of every case brought to the Court under the compromissory clause of a treaty is the claim that the Respondent's conduct violates its obligations under that treaty". It would be anomalous to hold that the Court has jurisdiction where there is an arguable claim that a treaty has been violated but lacks jurisdiction where there is a manifestly well-founded claim that the same treaty has been violated. Such a contention has no support in the jurisprudence or traditions of this Court or in the terms of the Optional Protocols. I continue to quote "indeed any such role would provide an incentive for States to flout their treaty obligations and to avoid offering any justification for their conduct in order to defeat the Court's jurisdiction". I would respectively suggest that the same reasoning applies here. A State party should not be permitted to divest the Court of jurisdiction by in effect confessing error, by in effect stating yes indeed our obligations were not complied with, we agree with the relevant obligation and therefore there is no dispute for all the reasons well stated by the United States in its earlier submissions.

The second reason that the concession of a violation cannot deprive this Court of jurisdiction is that, as this very case amply demonstrates, disputes about the "interpretation and application" of the Convention may well arise from disagreements about the consequences that should flow from a given violation. It may well be in this case that the Parties would be able to reach a stipulation with respect to the relevance of events and indeed perhaps reach a stipulation as to the underlying act or omission that brings the Parties to this Court and then move to a remedies phase or phase that would address the consequences that flow from those events. But that does not change the fact that there is a dispute here as to the interpretation and application of the treaty. Indeed I would suggest that the United States own arguments

this morning suggest that there is very much a disagreement on the subject of what consequences should flow from the omission that is not in issue.

The United States appears to have made two additional points with respect to jurisdiction that I would also like to address.

First, in at least one formulation this morning, the United States suggested that there was no jurisdiction because Paraguay had no legally cognizable claim. We disagree with that statement of course, with respect to Paraguay's claim but I note for the moment that it would in any event not afford a basis for denying jurisdiction; it is an argument properly addressed to the merits of the claim.

Second, the United States referred to Articles II and III of the Optional Protocol. I simply want to note that this Court of course may claim again in the *Tehran* hostages case, both in the provisional measures Order and in its final Judgment, that those Articles do not in any way affect the compulsory jurisdiction of this Court under Article I.

I would like now to address several of the circumstances that the United States suggested are relevant to Paraguay's Application.

First, the United States suggested that somehow Paraguay should be penalized for having filed its Application this past Friday, in light of the impending execution on 14 April.

This Court, I believe, will appreciate the magnitude of a decision by a Government like that of Paraguay to institute proceedings in the International Court of Justice against the United States. Needless to say, that is not a decision that is taken lightly. As we explained this morning, even last week there were discussions between the Parties as to ways to avoid the filing that was finally made late in the day on Friday.

As the United States itself advised the Court, those discussions foundered when it became clear that the United States was not prepared to take steps to halt the impending execution pending further discussions between the Parties, or pending some alternative means of dispute resolution. I add parenthetically that that is another reason of course why any recourse to Articles II and III was not available at this point, but of course an indication of provisional measures, and the continuance of this proceeding, will in no way make impossible further discussions on those topics. But for present purposes, if the Court were to now penalize Paraguay for its efforts to amicably resolve the dispute and to take all steps to avoid having to come to this Court, it would create what, we would respectfully suggest, would be an unwise different sentence to parties who wish to take every step to avoid a filing here, and for that reason we would respectfully suggest that that element should play no role in the Court's deliberations.

We would further suggest that it would be particularly inappropriate to allow any such circumstance to affect the Court's deliberations in this case.

As has been mentioned, Paraguay here went the extra mile to avoid coming to this Court. It took what we believe is a perfectly justifiable, but nonetheless unusual step, of filing a lawsuit first in the United States courts, asserting its own rights under the Vienna Convention, and seeking relief in the form of an injunction against further enforcement of the conviction and sentence of its national. It took the same position in that proceeding that it takes here, that is, it did not contest the authority of the Virginia officials to enforce its criminal law, and it did not contest the authority of the Virginia officials to re-try Mr. Breard if Paraguay received the relief it requested, if Virginia officials were so advised, which Paraguay fully expects they would be.

Because there has been some discussion of those proceedings, I would like to address two aspects of those proceedings in order to clarify the record before the Court.

First, there was a suggestion this morning that Paraguay at some point in those proceedings suggested that this case should not come before this Court, that the United States courts were the appropriate forum. I understand the United States is going to provide the Court with a June 3 diplomatic letter. We

are going to provide the Court as well with a letter that may shed some light on that exchange, which was a letter sent by Paraguay's counsel to counsel for the United States in the domestic litigation, which is of course the Department of Justice, in response to the position taken by the United States in the domestic litigation.

If the Court will permit me a moment.

In the initial proceeding in the district court, that is the federal trial court in the United States, the court held that Paraguay had standing to sue for breach of a treaty in the United States courts. It dismissed the suit, however, on an alternative jurisdictional ground that has to do with the constitutional structure of the United States, and the authority of a federal court to impose remedies against State officials. Paraguay appealed that decision.

In the court of appeals the United States filed a brief, *amicus curiae*, in which it urged the court of appeals not to rely on the ground relied upon by the district court, but instead to affirm on the alternative jurisdictional ground that a sovereign should not be permitted, that a suit by a sovereign in a court in the United States raises a non-justiciable controversy.

In the course of that brief, the United States took the position that in fact the proper form was diplomatic negotiations or this Court. At the same time, the United States suggested an argument that perhaps presaged the argument it makes here, that there would be no jurisdiction given that the Parties agreed on the obligations imposed by the Vienna Convention. In response to that position by the United States, Paraguay's counsel wrote a letter which we will happily provide to the Court, which stated what I have said this morning, that Paraguay had determined that it was appropriate to seek relief in the first instance from the municipal courts of the United States, had Paraguay been able to obtain effective relief, the Parties may never have come before this Court. Paraguay did not obtain that relief, but Paraguay has never suggested that the courts of the United States somehow by filing suit in the courts of the United States, it would somehow be foreclosed from its rights under the Optional Protocol, and the suggestion that the United States courts are in some way the appropriate forum is a bit difficult to understand in light of the position that the United States took in the domestic litigation that a sovereign, such as Paraguay, should not be permitted to sue for breach of treaty in those courts.

There is a second aspect of the United States litigation that I believe requires clarification after this morning's submissions.

The United States referred to some litigation in the United States, relatively recent litigation, arising from claims under the Vienna Convention in death penalty cases. No court in the United States has yet reached the merits of any such claim. I would like to briefly describe the two kinds of claims that have arisen, and perhaps give the Court some appreciation of the dilemma of a Government like Paraguay that seeks to vindicate its rights.

In the first instance there have been two cases by sovereigns. The first is that by Paraguay, and the second is a suit modelled on Paraguay's action that was filed by the United Mexican States in an attempt to halt the execution of one of its nationals. In both cases the district court dismissed on the constitutional immunity ground that I have just described, and in both cases the court of appeals affirmed on that ground. In other words, in neither case did the court reach the merits of the Vienna Convention claim. Indeed in the Paraguay lawsuit, in the lawsuit brought by the Government here, the Court emphasized the importance of the Vienna Convention, but simply held that it was disabled by the XIth Amendment to the United States Constitution from ordering the relief sought against State officials.

In the second category of cases are federal *habeas* claims by prisoners themselves seeking to attack their convictions on the basis of the Vienna Convention and a failure to provide the required notification. In all of those cases of which I am aware, and there are now probably three or four, the claim has not been raised until the prisoner has reached a federal court, on a *habeas* petition, that is, the claim was not raised in the proceedings in the state court, as in Mr. Breard's case, and was not raised in the state *habeas* proceedings. In that situation, the holdings are uniform, thus far, that the stringent limitations that both the United States Supreme Court has laid down and Congress has recently codified with respect to

habeas petitions generally, and death penalty *habeas* petitions in particular, bar the *habeas* petitioner from raising the claim. In other words, those courts too have not reached the merits, although I should note that in Mr. Breard's own case, again, oneof the judges on the panel — although he concurred in the judgment saying that the court could not provide relief — emphasized the importance of the rights at issue.

If you put the two cases involved with respect to Mr. Breard — that is Paraguay's case asserting its rights and Mr. Breard's case asserting his rights — together, the Court can appreciate the difficulty. The claim here arises from a failure to notify. Notwithstanding the discussion, the United States this morning with respect to what the Vienna Convention and what the various discussions were, it seems to me that there can be no dispute that an obligation in Article 36, paragraph 1 *(a)*, requiring the detaining State to advise the national of his right to consult consul, has a very obvious purpose, that is to ensure that that detainee is knowledgeable, becomes advised of his or her rights. And yet the combination of the holdings in Mr. Breard's case and in Paraguay's own suggest that, even in a case where the claim arises from failure to notify and the petitioner — the *habeas* petitioner, in one case — learns of the rights under the Vienna Convention only after he has gone through the proceeding in which he has been deprived of them, he is too late to raise them. Indeed, without going into the nuances of United States law, effectively the holding in Paraguay's own case, because of the peculiar limitations on federal courts' authority to provide relief, was to the same effect — that Paraguay because it was attacking or, in the understanding of the Court, attacking the judgment — was in effect too late because it would be undoing prior State action.

I do not mean to suggest that those cases are relevant to this Application. To my mind the only relevance here is that clearly Paraguay should not be penalized for some suggestion that it has delayed. Clearly there have been substantial efforts to resolve the dispute prior to reaching the Court.

There is, however, one more line of cases in the United States which may be relevant and that is, at least two courts have addressed the suggestion where the impact of a failure to notify under the Vienna Convention and the possible impact that might have on the enforcement of a conviction. We would be happy to provide the Court with a copy of the case that I am about to refer to, but it is a case from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit — this is one of the federal courts of appeals — and that case considered federal regulations that require federal officials, immigration officials, to advise an alien detainee of his or her rights under the Vienna Convention. The regulations are explicitly intended to implement the Vienna Convention, the obligations. The federal court to which I refer did set aside a conviction for illegal entry after deportation as a result of the immigration authority's failure to comply with this regulation. The court reversed the conviction on the ground that the underlying order of deportation was invalid because the arresting authorities had failed to notify the defendant at the time of his initial detention of his right to contact a consular official. The court went further to determine that prejudice was present and it therefore afforded the relief. It built on, by the way, an earlier case from the same court of appeals. In short, there is authority in the United States that, in fact, a failure to comply with the Vienna Convention obligations can have an effect on the validity of a conviction obtained in the tainted proceedings and I shall return to that point in a few moments when talking about the United States submissions on the merits.

I would like to address now the United States suggestion that there is no legally cognizable claim in so far as it might be relevant not to jurisdiction but to the circumstances forming the Court's decision whether to grant provisional measures.

I should start by noting that whatever the weight of this factor in another case, it is hard to see how it could weigh against provisional measures here where there appears to be agreement on the failure to comply with the underlying obligations and the dispute is very much about the consequences that should flow. It would seem to me that the Court should exercise serious caution in deciding in the face of a conceded violation — that the applicant State does not bring a sufficiently weighty case to warrant provisional measures. I would think that that caution would apply particularly where the suggestion of the United States that there is no remedy, and hence no legally cognizable claim, appears to contradict so squarely the fundamental principle as to the remedy of restitution, the applicability of that remedy in the event of an internationally wrongful act and the substance of that remedy, that is, to restore the situation

that existed prior to the wrongful act. Given that the United States position is so squarely inconsistent with that basic understanding, I would think the Court would want to exercise extreme caution before reaching a decision that somehow the Vienna Convention was intended as an exception to that principle.

In any event, however, we believe that the United States submission does not hold up even on its own terms.

First, the United States argument is essentially that the Court should conclude that Paraguay is not entitled to the remedy it seeks because one looks in vain, in Article 36 or elsewhere in the Vienna Convention, or even in the legislative history, for confirmation that that remedy is available. With all due respect, we would suggest that the United States is engaged on a misguided search. One need not find the remedy in the text of the Convention. If the United States argument were accepted, it would be necessary to reproduce the Articles on State Responsibility in every treaty and surely that is not the expectation of treaty drafters. Instead, the fundamental understanding with respect to remedies is part of a legal context in which any treaty must operate and therefore the fact that one does not find an explicit confirmation of the remedy Paraguay seeks in either the Optional Protocol or the Vienna Convention itself, should certainly not lead to the conclusion that that remedy is not available. Indeed, this Court would have to reverse or repudiate a long line of authorities because it has never imposed a requirement in considering whether particular remedy was available that that remedy appear in the given international instrument on which the claim was founded. Again, if one would recall the eminently justifiable range of remedies this Court provided in the *Tehran* hostages case one would have a hard time finding explicit confirmation for each of those remedies in the underlying instrument. In effect, the United States argument here, their reading of the Vienna Convention, will effectively limit this Court to grants of declaratory relief without the power to order a remedy. That role is plainly inconsistent with the understanding of parties who both adhere to an international treaty and subscribe to a dispute resolution protocol. It is intrinsic to the notion of a violation, as *Chorzów* itself suggests, that consequences flow from that violation.

Again, however, even on the United States own terms, even if one were looking to the Vienna Convention itself, there would not be the support that the United States finds.

First, with respect to Professor Lee's treatise. The case to which the United States referred, although it is only a brief account in the treatise, by no means suggests that a remedy is not available. Indeed, the Court actually went to the issue, or it appears from the brief account in Lee,and decided that the applicant could not show prejudice. From the brief account in Lee it appears that that case actually supports Paraguay's argument that a remedy is available, even if it may affect the validity of the underlying conviction. Lee then follows the discussion of the Italian case, with a discussion of the two cases from the United States that I have just described which indeed do draw consequences as to the validity of an underlying conviction from a failure to notify under Article 36. To the extent that it is relevant now — and I will address that issue in a moment — the weight of Lee's treatise suggests that Paraguay is entitled to its remedies.

Likewise with respect to the negotiating history, the United States points to certain sections of that drafting history to support a contention that the parties did not intend the Convention to alter the operation of domestic criminal proceedings. Yet the history on which the United States bases its argument support an opposite conclusion. In particular, the United States referred, but not by name, to statements by Mr. Kostov, a delegate of the Soviet Union and Mr. Avakov, a delegate of Belorussia, and presented those statements as supporting the view that the Convention did not intend to alter the effect or have any effect on domestic criminal proceedings. In fact, Mr. Kostov argued further that paragraph 2 of Article 36 as then drafted, and as ultimately adopted by the Convention, was an attempt to interfere with the internal affairs of States by hampering the administration of justice in regard to aliens, and that that version would make it difficult for States to exercise their sovereign right to prosecute aliens who broke the law. Mr. Kostov and Mr. Avakov spoke in support of restoring the ILC's draft of paragraph 1 of Article 36 *(b)*. Mr. Evans, a delegate of the United Kingdom, characterizes the Soviet proposal as follows: according to Mr. Evans, it would have meant that the laws and regulations of the receiving State would govern the rights specified in paragraph 1 provided that they did not render those rights completely inoperative. In the event, however, the Conference chose to eject the proposed Soviet

amendment. Thus, so far as we understand the statements, the legislative history on which the United States relies, was in support of an alternative to the provision in the Vienna Convention which would have deluded the effect of that Convention specifically with respect to its possible effect on criminal proceedings. Thus the legislative history supports the notion that the Convention in appropriate instances might even subordinate municipal criminal procedures tc the provisions of Article 36, paragraph 1.

The United States has also suggested that it would be unwise for this Court to grant Paraguay the remedies it seeks because that would somehow open the floodgates to claims like that brought by Paraguay.

We would respectfully submit that, in the first instance, that the fact that others might have the same right that Paraguay might have should not deter the Court from recognizing that right in Paraguay; that would be fundamentally inconsistent with the judicial role. But in any event we do not believe that there is any basis for the scare the United States raises. Contrary to the characterization of the United States, Paraguay's Application is not an appeal to this Court and the question before this Court is not whether, in every criminal proceeding involving a foreign national, a violation of the Vienna Convention requires a new trial. Paraguay's action is not an appeal, it does not ask the Court to review or reverse any judgment of a municipal court, it does not ask the Court to review the proceedings in that court or to review the judgments of that court. Further, the question is not what remedy would be required in every criminal proceeding everywhere in the world, the question is what can Paraguay show with respect to this proceeding and on the basis of that showing, what relief would it be entitled to. The facts relevant to that enquiry are quite discreet and to the extent that, as the United States suggested this morning, it would require a consul to bring on evidence with respect of practices of the like, if a court found that relevant, the foreign sovereign could certainly make a decision when it sought the relief whether or not it wished to do so.

Finally, as this case demonstrates, cases of this kind would prompt a sovereign to come to this Court only with the greatest reluctance and even on the terms of the United States own argument, we do not think there is any basis for the concern.

Finally, the United States suggests that Paraguay's Application would require this Court to anticipate a judgment and would in fact anticipate a judgment in favour of Paraguay. That suggestion is belied by the very disciplined and narrowly tailored relief that we request. But before addressing the relief Paraguay requests, I would like to examine the United States' submissions in the light of the concern that the United States itself raises, that is that an indication of provisional measures here might anticipate a judgment. The United States comes to this Court and asks the Court to reject Paraguay's Application on the basis of the facts that it says it will be able to prove, on the basis of a survey of State practice, of which we were advised this morning, and on the basis of a showing on the legal rights at issue that I have just addressed. Clearly the Parties disagree about certain aspects of the consequences of this behaviour. If the Court would arrest a denial of the request for provisional measures on an assumption that the United States will be able to prove its facts and Paraguay will not, that indeed would anticipate a judgment. Equally, the extent of the informal survey of State practice might be relevant to the eventual determination of this Court, surely the Court should not make a decision on the basis of the advice provided over this lectern as to an informal survey conducted by the United States Department of State. That too would surely anticipate the proof, and hence the judgment, that would be elicited at the merits phase. And finally the United States asked this Court to reject Paraguay's claim on the basis that it has no legally cognizable claim. Again, while we disagree with that suggestion and while we believe the suggestion is not supported even by the authorities that the United States cites, nothing would so surely anticipate a judgment by this Court than a conclusion that notwithstanding the violation in this case, the remedy Paraguay seeks is not available.

Conversely, Paraguay asks for provisional measures that are extremely narrow. The only thing in effect that Paraguay asks this Court to do at this time is to order that the United States ensure that Mr. Breard is not executed while this case is before the Court. We would welcome the views of other States parties that might intervene, we are certain that they would enlighten the Court and we would fully expect the Court to take into account any other State that were motivated enough to join these proceedings. But surely before receiving those views, the Court should ensure that the case stays before this Court, that

the case remains in its full dimension. As I stated this morning, Mr. Breard, even if this Court grants the interim relief, will remain in Virginia's custody. If the United States prevails on the merits on this case Virginia will be able to schedule a new execution date and put him to death. Surely the United States does not mean to suggest that the delay in executing the sentence of death overrides Paraguay's interest in the life of its national to the extent that the Court would wish to balance in any way the effect of these interim measures on the two Parties, or in any way to protect against a decision here, either granting or denying the provisional measures Paraguay seeks in a manner that anticipates its judgment. It plainly, Paraguay respectfully submits, must grant the narrowly tailored measures Paraguay seeks.

I very much appreciate the Court's courtesy this afternoon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you very much Mr. Donovan. Before you conclude the President would like to address a question to you.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Donovan, you referred to two United States cases which did overturn earlier decisions on the grounds of failure to comply with the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, if I understood you correctly. Did those decisions overturning the earlier judgments lead to retrials on the original charges or simply in dismissal of the original charges.

Mr. DONOVAN: I do not know the subsequent history of those cases. I do not believe that there is anything in those cases which would suggest that a retrial would not be possible and certainly, as I have said, it is not Paraguay's position here that a retrial would be barred. But I cannot definitively answer the Court's question, but I would be happy to do so when we provide those cases subsequently.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: May I ask what is the earliest time you could furnish an answer to that question.

Mr. DONOVAN: This afternoon, that is in so far as it is disclosed by the published accounts of those opinions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Donovan. That concludes the second round of oral pleading of Paraguay and we will have a short adjournment to enable the United States to make its submissions.

The Court adjourned from 3.50 to 4.20 p.m.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Please be seated. We meet now to hear the second round of oral submissions of the United States, and I give the floor to Mr. Andrews, Legal Adviser to the United States Department

of State.

Mr. ANDREWS: Mr. President, I would like to call to the podium Mr. John Crook to respond on behalf of the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Mr. Crook, please.

Mr. CROOK: Thank you Mr. President. Members of the Court.

In our final presentation this afternoon we will make, I believe, six points, attempting to bring together and respond to a number of the considerations that distinguished counsel for Paraguay introduced in his rebuttal. I shall try not to be too long.

My first point is this, that it seems to me that throughout this case, and certainly in the rebuttal we have just heard from Paraguay, there has been a signal of voidance of the burden of proof that the Applicant here must bear. They have in fact proved very little, if anything. Now Mr. Donovan in his presentation this afternoon tried to make up some of the deficiencies by seeking to build upon the evidence and argumentation that we gave you this morning. As to his arguments, I would simply invite the Court to consider the sources and determine in its own mind whether our reading of them, or Mr Donovan's reading of them, is the better. But it does seem to me that it is an anomalous position; a peculiar situation where the burden of the Applicant's proof is that the Respondent did not disprove the Applicant's assertions to the satisfaction of the Applicant. I would certainly disagree with that characterisation, but it does seem to me unsound in relation to the burdens that the Applicant here must bear.

There is one key issue here that I think we should take note of and it is an issue to which counsel for Paraguay did not refer, and that is the key issue of whether in fact consular access in this case would have made any difference. Counsel for Paraguay ignored that point in his summation, and it seems to me that it is an important point and is one that cannot be ignored, because all of Paraguay's case here rests on the factual premise, the assumption, the belief, that things would have been different had a Paraguayan consul been involved. For all the reasons that we suggested, the reasons that Ms Brown suggested, that seems to us to be not the case, that the burden here is on the Applicant, the burden has not been met.

My second basic point Mr. President, is that the Applicant here seems to me have responded to large parts of the United States submission by ignoring them or trivializing them. They ignored Ms Brown's long, and I think very informative description, of the realities of consular practice. Paraguay had nothing to say about that this afternoon. In large measure they ignored the indications that we brought to you regarding the realities of how States interpret and imply their obligations under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. They ignored altogether the circumstances of Mr. Breard's trial, defences for which he was charged, the adequacy of his counsel, the extensive nature of the appellate remedies that he pursued. They ignored large parts of the United States submission.

My third major point, Mr. President, is that it seems to me that the presentation here by distinguished counsel for Paraguay showed an undue preoccupation with the domestic litigation in the United States in which matters similar to these are being addressed. Counsel for Paraguay indicated that in his view, those cases were not relevant. We would agree, and we therefore will not seek here to re-argue them. I do wish here though to respond particularly to the cases that were raised at the last minute, and that were the occasion of the question from President Schwebel. The Applicant will presumably make those available to the Court, and the Court can inspect them and come to its own judgment regarding their implications. Our recollection is that the cases that the Court has requested were immigration cases involving deportation orders, and not criminal cases. That is our recollection, and we suffer from not

having the text with us, but it is our belief that they turned not on the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations obligations as such, but on the fact that the immigration service had failed to follow its own regulations, calling for consular notification. Under federal law, federal agencies are required to follow their regulations, and that was the basis for the courts' decision on those cases. That is our recollection, if we have mischaracterized them, the Court will soon have the opinions and will be able to see, but that is our understanding of what was involved in those cases.

My fourth point is that it seems to me that the Applicants in this case have ignored — have dealt with significant parts of the United States presentation this morning by ignoring it — or in any case by trivializing the implications. We spent a good deal of time here going through the implications of the course of action that is advocated by Paraguay, for example, for other governments, the other parties to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.

Counsel for Paraguay responded to that essentially by trivializing the point, saying we have one case and one case only here, and that's all the Court need concern itself about. With respect, Mr. President, that seems to me not to be good enough. With respect to the concerns of the United States, again, counsel for Paraguay minimized or trivialized the consequences of the remedy that they seek here, but again I think in all fairness, that is not good enough. The United States has significant interest in the orderly and authoritative administration of its criminal law, certainly in a case where the murder took place in 1992, the trial took place in 1993, and there appears to be no guilt, no dispute between the parties as to the guilt of the accused.

I think the same observation holds true as well concerning our points regarding the implications of the remedy sought by Paraguay for the Court. The concern is a real one, the implications for other countries and other situations are real, they cannot be ignored. That brings me closer to my final points, Mr. President.

The fifth point is the rather basic question. Is there a remedy? And the associated question, is there jurisdiction here? For the reasons that I indicated, it seems to me that the Court must consider the likelihood of Paraguay being able to show that the remedy that underlies their whole case exists and is available to them within the four corners of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. It is not appropriate for me here to re-argue the points I made this morning but I simply invite the Court to consider them. The point that there is no support in the text, the point that there is no support in the history, the point that there is no support in practice. I think it is a fair gloss on that, that Paraguay is quite unlikely to be able to show that the remedy it seeks either is available, or in any case, is to be found within the sphere of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations which of course is the requirement for there to be jurisdiction. We are at something of a disadvantage because Paraguay, as the Applicant, has never really made the case. We have sought to respond, Paraguay has then tried to make its case by dealing with our response and we are left in this very unsatisfactory situation, Mr. President, that the basic burden of the Applicant has not been met. I think I would agree here with distinguished counsel for Paraguay who, in his presentation this afternoon, used words to the effect — and I freely admit that this is a paraphrase and not a quote; I hope this is a fair paraphrase — that to find the remedy, you must go beyond the text of the treaty, that is the problem, Mr. President, there is no jurisdiction. The Applicants seem unlikely to prevail on the merits.

Let me turn to my sixth and final point, Mr. President, and that is the reference to the *Hostages* case. Now, there was I think perhaps a misunderstanding of our position and I want to deal with it, because I think it is important. It is not our contention here that the Court is divested of jurisdiction by reason of the fact that we have confessed error and admitted that Mr. Breard was not given consular notification, that is not our point at all. Our point is the much broader one, that I have just discussed, that the remedy that is sought here is a remedy that goes far beyond the scope of the Vienna Convention and far beyond the scope of the jurisdiction of the Court.

Let me respond to other points regarding the *Hostages* case. It does seem to me that it is — unseemly is perhaps too strong a word — but it is not quite right to draw upon the *Hostages* case as the precedent for action by this Court here. The *Hostages* case involved a much more aggravated situation, the continued detention of a large number of hostages in conditions of apparent danger, in violation of fundamental

rules for the protection of diplomats and consuls. It was a profound, potentially very dangerous, disruption of international relations and it seems to me that it perhaps trivializes that case to analogize it to a situation where the Applicant is seeking not to deal with matters of great consequence at stake in the *Hostages* case, but rather to disrupt the operations of the criminal courts of a party to the Statute of this Court. It seems to me the analogy is not appropriate and it is not one that should illuminate the deliberations of this Court. Mr. President, I apologize that these remarks have been somewhat disjointed, the circumstances are a bit difficult, but I hope they have been of some use in clarifying our position. As always my delegation appreciates the courtesy of the Court in listening to our presentation. You have heard already the submission of the United States Agent and it is only for me to thank the Court.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Crook. This brings us to the end of these oral hearings. I would like to express on behalf of the Court its warm thanks to the Agents, counsel and advocates of the Parties for the quality of their arguments and the courtesy and co-operation they have shown. In accordance with the usual practice, may I ask the Agents to remain at the disposal of the Court for any further information which it might need and, subject to that, I now declare closed the oral hearings on the request for the indication of provisional measures in the case concerning the *Application of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (Paraguay* v. *the United States)*. The Court will now withdraw to deliberate. The Order containing the decision of the Court will be read at a public sitting to be held on Thursday 9 April. There being no other matters before it today, the Court will now rise.

The Court rose at 4.35 p.m.